

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

SOPHOCLES

PHILOCTETES

EDITED BY SETH L. SCHEIN

SOPHOCLES
PHILOCTETES

EDITED BY
SETH L. SCHEIN

*Emeritus Professor of Comparative Literature,
University of California at Davis*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521681438

© Cambridge University Press 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by MPG Printgroup Ltd, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Sophocles.

Sophocles: *Philoctetes* / edited by Seth L. Schein, Emeritus Professor of Comparative Literature, University of California at Davis.

pages cm. – (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-0-521-86277-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. *Philoctetes* (Greek mythology) – Drama. 2. Trojan War – Drama. 3. Sophocles. *Philoctetes*. 4. Greek drama (Tragedy) – History and criticism. 5. *Philoctetes* (Greek mythology) in literature. I. Schein, Seth L. II. Title.

PA4413.P5 2013

882'.01 – dc23 2013005739

ISBN 978-0-521-86277-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-68143-8 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page ix</i>
<i>Abbreviations: editions, commentaries, reference works</i>	<i>xi</i>
Introduction	1
<u>1 Philoktetes in mythology, literature, and figurative art</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>1.1 The myth in archaic poetry</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>1.2 The myth in Attic drama</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>1.3 Lemnos</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>1.4 The myth in figurative art</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>2 The historical context</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>3 Setting</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>4 Staging</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>5 Intertexts</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>5.1 Philoktetes and Homeric epic</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>5.2 Philoktetes and the Kyklops in Homer and Euripides</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>6 The Chorus and the characters</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>6.1 The Chorus</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>6.2 Odysseus</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>6.3 Neoptolemos</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>6.4 Philoktetes</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>6.5 Herakles</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>7 Language and Style</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>8 Metre</u>	<u>36</u>
<u>8.1 Iambic trimeter</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>8.2 Trochaic tetrameter catalectic</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>8.3 Anapaestic dimeter</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>8.4 Sung (lyric) metre</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>9 Key to metrical abbreviations, terms, and symbols</u>	<u>41</u>
<u>10 Reception</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>10.1 The Hellenistic period</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>10.2 Rome</u>	<u>44</u>
<u>10.3 The early modern period</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>10.4 The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>10.5 The twentieth and twenty-first centuries</u>	<u>53</u>
<u>11 The transmission of the text</u>	<u>58</u>
<i>A note on the text and <u>apparatus criticus</u></i>	<i>61</i>
<u>ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>Commentary</u>	<u>112</u>
<u>Bibliography</u>	<u>347</u>
<u>Indexes</u>	<u>367</u>

PREFACE

I am immeasurably indebted to earlier commentators on *Philoktetes*, especially R. F. C. Brunck, G. Hermann, L. Campbell, T. B. L. Webster, J. C. Kamerbeek, P. Pucci, and especially R. C. Jebb. Jebb's interpretations have often influenced my understanding of the text even when they are not explicitly cited. In composing my text and critical apparatus, I have gratefully drawn on the authoritative work of A. C. Pearson, A. Dain, R. D. Dawe, H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, and G. Avezzi; I am also grateful to have benefited from the editions of the fragments of Aischylos and Sophokles by S. L. Radt and of Euripides by R. Kannicht in *TrGF*.

I have taken much longer than planned to complete this commentary and accumulated debts of various kinds to numerous colleagues and friends and to the students with whom I have read *Philoktetes* at the University of California, Davis, and the University of California, Santa Cruz. I would like to thank Victor Bers, Mark Griffith, Tony Long, and Donald Mastronarde for early encouragement and support, and I also am indebted to Donald Mastronarde for much needed help with computer software. I am grateful to Sarah Nooter (and her students at the University of Chicago), Andrea Rodighiero, and especially Maria Serena Mirto for detailed criticism and corrections of the text and commentary and to Sheila Murnaghan for reading and improving the introduction. I profited from the opportunity to test several portions of the text and commentary in workshops with colleagues and graduate students at Princeton University, UCLA and the University of Chicago. Some of the ideas in the introduction and commentary were developed in highly enjoyable conversations several decades ago with Carola Greengard (now Carola Marte), when she was writing *Theatre in crisis: Sophocles' reconstruction of genre and politics in Philoktetes*. I also have benefited from advice and suggestions on particular points from Luigi Battezzato, Elaine Fantham, Nancy Felson, Rachel Kitzinger, Donald Mastronarde, Enrico Medda, Sarah Nooter, Morton Paley, Rush Rehm, Oliver Taplin, Mario Telò, and Nancy Worman. For recommending or helping me to obtain relevant publications and sharing their own work, I am grateful to Pascale Brillet-Dubois, Felix Budelmann, Bruno Currie, Nancy Felson, Patrick Finglass, Rachel Friedman, Carolin Hahneemann, Mache Païzi-Apostolopoulou, Pietro Pucci, and Julia Shear. I would like to thank Zoë Stachel for checking references and drafting the indexes.

I am grateful to the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Loeb Classical Library Foundation for research fellowships in 2004–2005, which enabled me to work uninterruptedly on this project; the University of California, Davis, for two terms of sabbatical leave in 2007–2008 and one term in 2011, which were similarly helpful; and the Academic Senate of the University of California, Davis, for a series of small research grants. I am also grateful to the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, especially Glenn Most and former Director, Salvatore

Settis, for their generous hospitality in 2007–2008, and to Pantelis Michelakis and Amanda Wrigley at the Oxford University Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama in 2004, who helped me to locate material on modern productions and adaptations of *Philoktetes*.

I also would like to thank the editors at Cambridge University Press from whose expertise and professionalism I have benefited: Michael Sharp, for his advice and patience when I took far longer than expected to complete the project; Josephine Lane, who prepared my typescript for production; and Jodie Hodgson, who was the Production Editor. I am especially grateful to Linda Woodward for her expert copyediting, which made my writing more accurate, clear, and consistent. Working with her has been an enjoyable and instructive experience.

Most of all, I would like to thank Pat Easterling and Richard Hunter, Greek Editors of the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, for inviting me to contribute a volume on *Philoktetes* to the series, for detailed criticism of multiple drafts of the text, commentary, and introduction, and for helpful responses to my numerous questions. It has been a privilege and pleasure to benefit from their expertise and editorial experience. I probably should have heeded their criticism and followed their advice and the suggestions of other colleagues even more often than I did; I alone am responsible for any remaining errors and other faults of style and substance.

I first studied *Philoktetes* as an undergraduate in a course taught by Helen Bacon, with whom I continued to discuss the play on and off for over four decades. I dedicate this volume to her memory, in the hope that it will stimulate further scholarship on this deeply engaging work and lead to its being read and taught more often.

I have transliterated Greek names throughout, including that of Philoktetes, but Philoctetes and Sophocles appear on the cover and title page in accordance with the norms of the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Series.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Mr Ron Pullins for permission to reuse, in the Introduction to the present work, a revised version of several pages originally published as part of the interpretive essay in S. L. Schein, *Sophokles, Philoktetes: Translation with notes, introduction, and interpretive essay*, Focus Classical Library (Newburyport, Mass.: Focus Publishing/R. Pullins & Co., 2003).

ABBREVIATIONS: EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES, REFERENCE WORKS

Bruhn	<i>Sophokles erklärt</i> von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck, Achter Band, <i>Anhang</i> , zusammengetellt von. E. Bruhn (Berlin 1899)
Campbell, <i>Essay</i>	L. Campbell, 'Introductory essay on the language of Sophocles', in <i>Sophocles</i> , ed. L. Campbell, vol. 1, 2nd edn (Oxford 1879): 1-107 (references are to numbered paragraphs)
Chadwick	J. Chadwick, <i>Lexicographica Graeca</i> (Oxford 1997)
Chantraine, <i>DELG</i>	P. Chantraine, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i> (Paris 1968-80)
Chantraine, <i>GH</i>	P. Chantraine, <i>Grammaire Homérique</i> , 2 vols. (Paris 1958-63)
D-K	H. Diels and W. Kranz, <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , 10th edn (Berlin 1961)
<i>EGM</i>	R. L. Fowler, <i>Early Greek mythography</i> , vol. 1 (Oxford 2000)
Ellendt	F. Ellendt, <i>Lexicon Sophocleum</i> , 2nd edn rev. H. Genthe (Berlin 1872)
<i>GMT</i>	W. W. Goodwin, <i>Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb</i> (London 1889) (references are to numbered paragraphs)
<i>GP</i>	J. D. Denniston, <i>The Greek Particles</i> , 2nd edn (Oxford 1954)
K-B	R. Kühner, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Erster Teil, Elementar- und Formenlehre</i> , 3rd edn, 2 vols., rev. F. Blass (Hanover 1890-1892) (references are to volume and page number)
K-G	R. Kühner, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Teil, Satzlehre</i> , 3rd edn, 2 vols., rev. B. Gerth (Hanover 1898-1904) (references are to volume and page number)
Leutsch-Schneidewin	E. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin, <i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , 2 vols. (Göttingen 1839-51) (references are to the reprint by G. Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung (Hildesheim 1965)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> , rev. H. Stuart Jones (Oxford 1925-1940), with Revised

	Supplement edited by P. G. W. Glare and A. A. Thompson (Oxford 1996)
Moorhouse	A. C. Moorhouse, <i>The Syntax of Sophocles</i> (Leiden 1982)
OCD	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow, eds., <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , 4th edn (Oxford 2012)
OGCMA	J. D. Reid, <i>The Oxford Guide to Classical Mythology in the Arts, 1300–1990s</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford 1993)
PCG	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , eds. R. Kassel and C. Austin, 8 vols. (Berlin 1983–2001)
SCG	B. L. Gildersleeve, <i>Syntax of Classical Greek</i> , 2 vols. (New York 1900–1911) (references are to volume and page number)
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, <i>Greek Grammar</i> , rev. G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass. 1956) (references are to numbered paragraphs)
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , eds. B. Snell, R. Kannicht and S. Radt, 5 vols. (Göttingen 1971–2004)

N.B. Abbreviations of ancient authors and works generally follow LSJ and *OCD*. In references to Attic tragedies and comedies, the titles of plays are abbreviated as follows (plays by each author in probable chronological order):

(Aesch.) *Pers.* (*Persae*, *Persians*), *Sep.* (*Septem contra Thebas*, *Seven against Thebes*), *Supp.* (*Supplices*, *Suppliant Women*), *Ag.* (*Agamemnon*), *Cho.* (*Choephoroi*, *Libation Bearers*), *Eum.* (*Eumenides*), *PV* (*Prometheus Vinculus*, *Prometheus Bound*);

(Soph.) *Aj.* (*Ajax*), *Ant.* (*Antigone*), *Tr.* (*Trachiniai*, *Women of Trachis*), *OT* (*Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus the King*), *El.* (*Electra*), *Ph.* (*Philoctetes*), *OC* (*Oedipus Coloneus*, *Oedipus at Colonus*);

(Eur.) *Alc.* (*Alcestis*), *Med.* (*Medea*), *Hcl.* (*Heracleidae*, *Children of Heracles*), *Hipp.* (*Hippolytus*), *Andr.* (*Andromache*), *Hec.* (*Hecuba*), *Supp.* (*Supplices*, *Suppliant Women*), *El.* (*Electra*), *Her.* (*Heracles*), *Tro.* (*Troades*, *Trojan Women*), *IT* (*Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*), *Ion*, *Hel.* (*Helena*, *Helen*), *Pho.* (*Phoenissae*, *Phoenician Women*), *Or.* (*Orestes*), *Ba.* (*Bacchae*), *IA* (*Iphigenia Aulidensis*) (*Iphigenia at Aulis*);

(Ar.) *Ach.* (*Acharnes*, *Acharnians*), *Eq.* (*Equites*, *Knights*), *Nub.* (*Nubes*, *Clouds*), *Vesp.* (*Vespae*, *Wasps*), *Pax* (*Peace*), *Av.* (*Aves*, *Birds*), *Lys.* (*Lysistrata*), *Thesm.* (*Thesmophoriazusae*, *Women at the Thesmophoria*), *Ran.* (*Ranae*, *Frogs*), *Eccl.* (*Ecclesiazusae*, *Women in the Assembly*), *Plut.* (*Plutus*, *Wealth*).

I refer to Soph.'s plays only by title and to the other works by author and title.

INTRODUCTION

1 PHILOKTETES IN MYTHOLOGY, LITERATURE, AND FIGURATIVE ART

1.1 *The myth in archaic poetry*

The myth of Philoktetes was well established in Greek poetic tradition long before Sophokles' play was produced in 409 BCE and would have been familiar to his audience. Philoktetes was the son of Poias, King of Meliboia, in the region known as Magnesia in southeastern Thessaly, near Mt Oita and the Malian Gulf. As a youth he was the companion of Herakles, in whose conquest of Troy he participated and with whom he was numbered among the Argonauts (as was his father Poias). When Herakles was dying in agony on Mt Oita, Philoktetes alone was willing to light his funeral pyre, for which he received from Herakles his bow (originally the gift of Apollo) and deadly arrows. (In another version of the story, Poias lit the pyre, received the bow, and gave it Philoktetes.) Philoktetes commanded seven ships in the Greek fleet that sailed against Troy to avenge Helen's abduction by Paris. On the way to Troy, while sacrificing at the shrine of Chryse on Tenedos (or on the island of Chryse), Philoktetes was bitten by a water snake. The wound was incurable, his cries of pain so loud and disturbing, and his odour so foul and unendurable that Odysseus, at the command of Agamemnon and Menelaos and on behalf of the Greek army, marooned him on Lemnos. After ten years, the Greeks learned from the Trojan prophet Helenos that they could not win the war without the aid of Philoktetes and his Heraklean weapons, so they sent – in different versions of the story – Diomedes, Odysseus, or both Diomedes and Odysseus to bring him back from Lemnos. Initially, Philoktetes refused to go to Troy, out of hatred for the Greeks, especially Odysseus and the sons of Atreus. The Greek envoy(s), however, overcame his reluctance by some combination of persuasion, trickery, and force. When he arrived at the Greek camp before Troy, he was healed by Machaon and/or Podaleirios, the sons of Asclepios, then killed Paris in an archery duel and participated in the sack of the city.¹

¹ Cf. *Il.* 2.716–24, *Od.* 3.188–90, 8.219–20, *Cypria*, *Argumentum*, *Ilias Parva*, *argumentum*, Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 50–6 with Σ *ad* 100 = Bacchyl. fr. 7, Σ on Soph. *Ph.* 194, Ov. *Met.* 13.45–54, 313–38, D. Chr. 52, 59. Late mythographers and other sources sometimes preserve features of the myth that go back to the Cyclic epics, but often include mythical details invented to account rationally, realistically or ethically for one or another aspect of the traditional story. Cf. [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.27, 5.8, Hyg. 102, Quint. Smyrn. 9.327–527, 10.167–245; Serv. on *Aen.* 3.401–2, Eust. *Il.* 323, 44, 330, 1–20. Cf. Masciadri 2008: 38–111; C. Müller 2000: 25–71; Pipili 1994: 376–7; Avezzi 1988.

At *Il.* 2.716 ff., the *Iliad* refers to

Οἱ δ' ἄρα Μηθώνην καὶ Θαυμακίην ἐνέμοντο
καὶ Μελίβοιαν ἔχον καὶ Ὀλιζῶνα τρηχεῖαν,
τῶν δὲ Φιλοκτῆτης ἦρχεν τόξων ἐὺ εἰδῶς
ἑπτὰ νέων· . . .

720

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κείτῳ κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων,
Λήμνῳι ἐν ἡγαθέῃ, ὅθι μιν λίπον υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν
ἔλκεϊ μοχθίζοντα κακῶι ὀλοόφρονος ὕδρου·
ἐνθ' ὃ γε κείτ' ἄχέων· τάχα δὲ μνήσεσθαι ἔμελλον
Ἀργεῖοι παρὰ νηυσὶ Φιλοκτῆταο ἀνακτος.

725

those who lived around Methone and Thaumakia
and held Meliboia and rough Olizon,
Philoktetes led them, skilled with the bow,
(led) their seven ships . . .

But he lay in the island suffering overwhelming pains,
in sacred Lemnos, where the sons of the Achaeans had left him
labouring in agony from the evil wound of the malignant water
snake;
there he lay in pain, but soon the Argives beside their ships
were going to remember King Philoktetes.

(*Il.* 2.716–25)

This passage does not mention either the prophecy of Helenos or that Philoktetes would use the bow of Herakles to win the war for the Greek army. 2.724, however, describing Philoktetes, ἐνθ' ὃ γε κείτ' ἄχέων· τάχα δὲ μνήσεσθαι ἔμελλον ('there he lay in pain, but soon (the Argives) were going to remember (King Philoktetes)) recalls 2.694, referring to Achilles, τῆς δὲ γε κείτ' ἄχέων, τάχα δ' ἀνστήσεσθαι ἔμελλεν ('he lay grieving for her (*sc.* Briseis), but soon he was going to rise up'). The similarity between the two lines in sound and sense suggests (1) that Philoktetes is a hero comparable to Achilles in his power to affect the outcome of the war, (2) the inevitability of his return to the fighting after a period of personal suffering, and (3) the familiarity of his story to the poet and his audience. Both are bearers of divine weapons and a special destiny, and it is perhaps no accident that Philoktetes, in Sophokles' play, speaks of Neoptolemos as 'son of a father who was nearest and dearest (to me)' (242, cf. 242–3n.) and is more Achillean than Neoptolemos himself (cf. 601–2n.).

At *Od.* 8.219–20, Odysseus tells the Phaeacians, 'Only Philoktetes surpassed me with the bow | in the land of the Trojans, when we Achaeans used to shoot with bows', but he too does not speak of the bow of Herakles or Philoktetes' special role in the sack of Troy, understandably enough in a poem where Odysseus himself

is 'the sacker of cities' *par excellence*, and Odysseus' ruse of the wooden horse was the decisive factor in the fall of the city. The only other mention of Philoktetes in the *Odyssey* is at 3.188–90, where Nestor tells Telemachos, '[T]hey say . . . | . . . | that Philoktetes, the glorious son of Poias, came home successfully.'

The story was told more fully in the *Kypria* of how Philoktetes was bitten by a water snake, when the Greek army stopped at the island of Tenedos to sacrifice on its way to Troy, then was left behind on Lemnos because of his foul smell.² There is no indication of why Philoktetes was attacked by the snake.³ In the *Little Iliad*, 'Odysseus ambushes and captures the Trojan prince Helenos, and when this man had prophesied about the capture of Troy, Diomedes brings Philoktetes back from Lemnos. And this man, healed by Machaon, kills Paris in single combat.' The wording suggests that Helenos said the Greeks needed Philoktetes (or Philoktetes and his bow) to take Troy, therefore Diomedes brought him back to the Greek army; there is no mention of how Diomedes brought him back – by persuasion, by force, or in some other way.

At *Pythian* 1.50–6 (470 BCE), Pindar makes Philoktetes a mythological parallel to Hieron, who won military victories despite a serious illness and whom 'by force of necessity even one who was proud fawned into a friend' (51–2). Both Hieron and Philoktetes, though ill, played a decisive role in triumphs over non-Greek enemies (cf. *Pyth.* 1.72–5, 79–80). Pindar does not mention that Philoktetes was cured of his disease before killing Paris and helping to win the war, in order to make him seem more like Hieron, who is reported to have campaigned successfully, even though he had to be carried in a litter.⁴

1.2 The myth in Attic drama

In classical Athens, Philoktetes was the subject of at least six tragedies, in addition to Sophokles' *Philoktetes*. Aischylos (*TrGF* 3 fr. 249–57), Euripides (*TrGF* 5.27 3 fr. 787–803), and Theodektes of Phaselis (fourth century, *TrGF* 1 72 fr. 5b) dramatized the same part of the myth as Sophokles, in which the Greeks persuade, trick, or force Philoktetes to leave Lemnos in order to help the army at Troy. Aristotle (*EN* 7.8.1150b9–10) mentions approvingly that Theodektes' Philoktetes tried to

² Bernabé, *Cypria, Argumentum*: 41 (= West 2003: 76). Apollod. *Epit.* 3.27 says that the sacrifice was to Apollo, and Odysseus 'put Philoktetes out on Lemnos with his Heraklean bow by the order of Agamemnon'.

³ Some later sources specify that Philoktetes was guiding the Greek army to the shrine of the goddess Chryse, because he had been there with Herakles on the expedition that ended in the sack of Troy. When he was showing the Greeks the shrine of Chryse, so that they might pray for success, he was bitten by the serpent (or, in another version of the story, was wounded when he dropped one of Herakles' poisoned arrows on his own foot).

⁴ Cf. E. Cingano on *Pyth.* 1.54–5, in Gentili, Bernardini, Cingano, and Giannini 2000: 347. According to Σ *Pyth.* 1.100 = Bacchyl. fr. 7, 'Bacchylides too told the story that the Greeks summoned Philoktetes from Lemnos, after Helenos had prophesied, for it had been fated that Ilion not be sacked without the bow of Herakles'.

resist the pain resulting from the snakebite, though it eventually overcame him. Aspasios (second century CE), commenting on this passage of the *EN*, explains that when Philoktetes could no longer bear the pain, he had to reveal it. Another, anonymous commentator on the same passage says that Theodektes' Philoktetes cried out (ἐβόα) and quotes the only surviving words from the play, κόψατε τὴν ἐμὴν χεῖρα ('cut off my hand') to illustrate his comment that Theodektes' Philoktetes had been bitten by the snake in his hand, not his foot.⁵

In addition to the plays of Aischylos, Sophokles, and Theodektes that were set in Lemnos, Sophokles, in *Philoktetes at Troy* (*TrGF* 4 fr. 697–703), and Achaïos of Eretria (fifth century), in *Philoktetes* (*TrGF* 1 fr. 37), dramatized events that took place after Philoktetes had come to Troy, including his healing by Machaon and/or Podaleirios and his slaying of Paris; in addition, *P.Oxy.* 3216 preserves a fragment by an unknown poet of what may have been a 'Philoktetes at Troy' (*TrGF* 2 *Adesp.* fr. 654). Nothing beyond the title is known of a *Philoktetes* by the fifth-century tragic poet Philokles (*TrGF* 1.24 fr. 1). Plutarch twice quotes two lines 'spoken to Philoktetes' and warning of his unsuitability as a bridegroom, which may come from a satyr play (*TrGF* 2 *Adesp.* fr. 10).

Several comic playwrights wrote Philoktetes-plays: Epicharmos (sixth–fifth century, *PCG* 1 fr. 131, 132), Strattis (late fifth–early fourth century, *PCG* 7 fr. 44, 45), and Antiphanes (fourth century, *PCG* 2 fr. 218). The fragments of Epicharmos and Strattis have no particular relevance to Sophokles' play, unless Strattis' was a parody, but Antiphanes' fragment, though its context is unclear, perhaps recalls the characterization of Sophokles' Odysseus: σοφὸν γε τοῖ τι πρὸς τὸ βουλευεῖν ἔχει / τὸ γῆρας, ὥς δὲ πόλλ' ἰδὼν τε καὶ πάθον ('old age has some wisdom, at least in regard to planning, | since it has seen much and suffered much').⁶

The Philoktetes plays of Aischylos and Euripides are known from a few extant fragments and from the fifty-second *Discourse* (c. 100 CE) of the Greek orator and popular philosopher, Dio of Prusa, also known as Chrysostomos ('Golden Mouth').⁷ Dio compares these two plays and Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, as if they were all staged in competition with one another in the theatre of Dionysos in Athens,

⁵ Cf. Snell, *TrGF* 1 72 F 5b: 233.

⁶ Cf. Soph. fr. 260 (from *Thyestes*): 'but good sense often accompanies old age, and planning what needs (to be planned)'.

⁷ There is little detailed evidence of the plot of Aischylos' play. Its major innovations seem to have been its vivid representation of Philoktetes' intense pain and emotion and its dramatic focus on the conflict between Philoktetes and Odysseus, who comes to Lemnos as the representative of the Greek army, instead of Diomedes who came to retrieve Philoktetes in the *Little Iliad*. For attempted reconstructions, see C. Müller 2000: 38–64; cf. Jouan and Van Looy 2002: 272–7, Sommerstein 2008: 250–6. Far more is known and can be conjectured about Euripides' play, in which Odysseus and Diomedes together come to persuade or force Philoktetes to accompany them to Troy. Dio gives a prose summary of the Prologue in *Discourse* 59. Cf. Müller 1997, Jouan and Van Looy 2002: 278–312, Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert 2004: 1–34, Collard and Cropp 2008: 368–403. For a fragment of what may be the hypothesis of Aesch.'s. play, see *P. Oxy* 2256.5 = *TrGF* III fr. 451w. For a better preserved, but still fragmentary, hypothesis of Euripides' play, see *P. Oxy*.

during the City Dionysia, even thought he knows that this is chronologically impossible and that tragic poets rarely (if ever) competed against one another with plays on the same theme (52.3–4).⁸ In fact, Aischylos' play probably dates from the first third of the fifth century, Euripides' was produced in 431 BCE, in the same tetralogy as *Medea*, and Sophokles' was first staged in 409.

Dio describes the 'theme' (52.2. *hypothesin*) of the three Philoktetes-plays as 'the theft – or perhaps one should say violent seizure – of Philoktetes' bow . . .', and says that at the end of each play Philoktetes, deprived of his weapon, is taken to Troy 'for the most part voluntarily, but to some extent by compelling persuasion (τὸ μὲν πλέον ἑκὼν, τὸ δέ τι καὶ πειθοῖ ἀναγκαίαι), since he had been robbed of the weapon which provided his means of living on the island and courage in the face of [his] disease, along with his glory' (52.2). Dio, however, in stating this common 'theme', ignores or obscures important differences between the plays of Aischylos and Euripides, on the one hand, and Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, on the other.

The most obvious difference is that in Aischylos and Euripides, Philoktetes is compelled or persuaded to go to Troy, when Odysseus or Odysseus and Diomedes steal the bow, probably while Philoktetes is asleep after suffering a paroxysm. In Sophokles, however, Philoktetes' paroxysm heightens the play's ethical complexity, by providing the occasion for Neoptolemos' crisis of conscience, which eventually leads him to return the bow. Even when he is helpless without the bow, which he has given to Neoptolemos for safekeeping before his paroxysm, Philoktetes resists Neoptolemos' attempts to persuade him to go to Troy, but voluntarily chooses to rejoin the army, after the deified Herakles, speaking *ex machina*, tells him to do so. Thus in Aischylos and Euripides, the main action of the play is Odysseus' successful intrigue, but in Sophokles it is Philoktetes' decision to embrace his destiny.

In the Philoktetes-plays of Aischylos and Euripides, as far as one can judge from the fragments and from Dio's summary, Philoktetes will go to Troy only because of the theft of the bow; there is no *deus ex machina* whom he chooses to obey, as he obeys Herakles in Sophokles' play. Divinity, to be sure, is present in both plays, insofar as the action is triggered by the prophecy of Helenos, and from the very beginning of Euripides' drama, Athena protects and supports Odysseus by altering his appearance. She does this, however, as his personal patron, not as the representative of Zeus and not as an old friend, formerly mortal, with whom Odysseus can identify and whose words and suffering have special meaning for him, as Herakles' words have special meaning for Philoktetes in Sophokles' play.⁹

2455.17 = *TrGF* v.2 τ iii a (cf. C. Müller 2000: 144–7, 224–30; Jouan and van Looy 2002: 280–1; Collard, Cropp and Gibert 2004: 14–15 = Collard and Cropp 2008: 374–7).

⁸ Cf. Hunter 2009: 39–48, who shows that Dio's *synkrisis* is shaped by a 'classical' tradition of criticism, going back to Aristophanes' *Frogs*, that viewed Sophokles as occupying 'the midpoint between "simple" Aeschylus and "complex" (ποικίλος) Euripides' (44).

⁹ Cf. Kott 1974: 178–9, H. Flashar 1999: 90, 2000: 149.

Another fundamental difference between the *Philoktetes*-plays of Aischylos and Euripides, on the one hand, and Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, on the other, is that no character in either Aischylos' or Euripides' play undergoes the ethical growth evident in Sophokles' Neoptolemos. Odysseus in Aischylos and Odysseus and Diomedes in Euripides do not hesitate, in the first place, to use deceit in order to gain possession of the bow, as Neoptolemos does in Sophokles' play (86–95), nor do they change their minds out of sympathy and friendship with *Philoktetes* and decide to return it.

As Dio notes, Aischylos and Euripides represent Lemnos as populated, while in Sophokles the island is 'un trodden and uninhabited' (2). This means that the isolation and misery of *Philoktetes* in Sophokles' play are absolute, until the arrival of Odysseus and Neoptolemos: ἄνδρα δύστηνον, μόνον, | ἔρημον ὧδε κάφιλον κακούμενον (227–8, cf. 1018).¹⁰ In Euripides, however, *Philoktetes* has a friend, the shepherd Aktor, who comes to see him from time to time, and may bring him the news that a Trojan embassy has arrived to plead for his assistance (Dio 52.8, cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 102.2). In addition, both Aischylos and Euripides make the chorus consist of Lemnians, who visit *Philoktetes* (for the first time in ten years!), while in Sophokles' play there is a chorus of Neoptolemos' soldier-sailors. Dio finds Aischylos' chorus 'altogether simpler and more tragic' (τῶι παντὶ τραγικώτερον καὶ ἀπλούστερον) than Euripides', which he calls 'more civil and correct' (πολιτικώτερον καὶ ἀκριβέστερον), noting that Aischylos' chorus, when they first arrive, say nothing about their previous neglect of *Philoktetes*, but Euripides' chorus apologize 'because in ten years they neither approached *Philoktetes* nor gave him any assistance at all' (52.7–8).

The contrast Dio draws between the two choruses is analogous to the way in which he distinguishes between the 'grandeur and archaic flavour' of Aischylos' play, with its 'ruggedly original thought and expression appropriate to tragedy and to the ancient manners of the heroes' (52.4), and the 'intelligence' and 'concern for every detail' of Euripides' play, which is antithetical to Aischylos' in the way in which 'it is realistically political and oratorical and can be most useful to its readers' (52.11). Aischylos' Odysseus does not bother to disguise himself out of fear that he might be recognized, while Euripides' Odysseus is, realistically, anxious about being recognized, even though his appearance has been transformed by Athena. Aischylos' Odysseus gains *Philoktetes*' trust by a lying story that Agamemnon and Odysseus are dead and Odysseus shamefully disgraced; he does not, however, use 'elaborate art and scheming' (ποικίλης τέχνης καὶ ἐπιβουλῆς, Dio 52.10), and Dio comments that 'shrewd and crafty, as men were in those days, Aischylos' Odysseus is far removed from the malignity of today' (δριμύν καὶ δόλιον, ὥς ἐν τοῖς τότε, πολὺ δὲ ἀπέχοντα τῆς νῦν κακοθείας, Dio 52.5). Euripides' Odysseus, on the other hand, is modern in a way that recalls

¹⁰ In making Lemnos uninhabited, Sophokles departs strikingly from both mythological tradition and historical reality. Cf. 2n.

fifth-century Athenian political leaders, and 'he compels himself more than others to toil for the common victory and salvation' (Dio 59.1), in order to maintain the glory he has won and stand out in the city (Dio 59.2, Eur. fr. 787.1–2, 788.2–3).¹¹

1.3 *Lemnos*

Sophokles' audience in 409 BCE would have been surprised, even shocked, to find Lemnos uninhabited in the play. They would have known that the island, the largest in the north central Aegean Sea, had always been inhabited and for nearly a hundred years had been an Athenian ally, helping to secure the key trade route to Thrace and the Black Sea, on which the Athenians depended for supplies of grain and timber. The Athenian general Miltiades had settled some colonists on Lemnos in the early years of the fifth century (Hdt. 4.136–40), and in the early 440s Athens had established a colony of Athenian citizens, who not long afterward dedicated a bronze statue of Athena by Pheidias on the Athenian acropolis, which came to be known as the 'Lemnian Athena' (Paus. 1.28.2). These Lemnian Athenians maintained their ancestral dialect and customs (Thuc. 7.57.2) and fought alongside the Athenians throughout the Peloponnesian War (e.g. at Pylos and Amphipolis and in Sicily, cf. Thuc. 4.28.4, 5.8.2, 7.57.2).¹²

Sophokles' audience would have been familiar not only with the Aeschylean and Euripidean versions of the Philoktetes story, but with other well known myths involving Lemnians. For example, at *Il.* 1.593–4, Hephaistos describes how once, when Zeus hurled him from heaven, he 'fell in Lemnos . . . , | where the Sintian men took care of me . . .'.¹³ Elsewhere in the poem, Lemnos is called 'well inhabited' (21.40); its king, Euneos sends wine to Agamemnon and Menelaos and is also said to have given Patroklos a beautiful mixing bowl as a ransom for Lykaon, whom Achilles had captured (23.746–7). In Aeschylos' *Libation Bearers* 631–4, the Chorus sing: 'of evils, the Lemnian takes pride of place | in story and is lamented as abhorrent | by the people, and one compares | the terrible deed anew to Lemnian disasters', alluding to the murder by the Lemnian women of all the men in the island except King Thoas, who was spared by his daughter Hypsipyle (Apollod. 1.9.16). Hdt. 6.138.1–4 tells of another 'Lemnian evil', the murder by the Lemnian men of Athenian women abducted from Brauron as concubines, along with their children, and says that this crime and the murder of their men by the Lemnian women 'have made it customary throughout Greece to call shocking and abominable deeds "Lemnian"' (Hdt. 6.138.4).¹⁴

Despite these traditional myths, in Sophokles' play Lemnos is a harsh, physically demanding, and uninhabited (οὐδ' οἰκουμένην, cf. 2n.) landscape in which

¹¹ Cf. Olson 1991: 280–3, Collard 2004: 11 with n. 5. Dio's 'today' refers to the late first or early second century CE, when he was writing.

¹² Cf. Meiggs 1972: 524–5.

¹³ The Sintians were pre-Greek inhabitants of the island, cf. Kirk 1985: 113.

¹⁴ See Masciadri 2008: 201–58.

Philoktetes struggles to maintain a primitive, painful, and lonely existence. It is, in effect, not part of 'the inhabited earth' (ἡ γῆ οἰκουμένη), which was thought of 'as a region made coherent by the intercommunication of its inhabitants',¹⁵ and because of his utter isolation from other human beings, Philoktetes on Lemnos is himself no longer fully human. He is in an 'eremitic space', a desolated wilderness unlike places where humans live in societies.¹⁶ Odysseus describes this eremitic space not only as 'uninhabited' but also as 'untrodden' (2 ἄσπιπτος), a paradoxical term, considering that the play refers on several occasions to Philoktetes' highly distinctive στίβος ('tread', 'way of walking'), e.g. 163, 206, 487, cf. 2n.). Yet this 'tread' is so unlike the 'tread' of other human beings that Odysseus can ignore it.

There is, however, another 'inhabitant' of Lemnos with whom Philoktetes shares this 'way of walking', the lame god Hephaistos. Mythologically, Hephaistos was not only thrown from heaven by Zeus and rescued by the Sintians, but also was once thrown out by Hera, landed on Lemnos, and was saved and cared for by Thetis and Eurynome, for whom he made metal jewelry for nine years (*Il.* 18.395–405). Historically, Lemnos was sacred to Hephaistos as the god of fire and craft;¹⁷ the Kabeiroi, blacksmith gods with cult centres on Lemnos and at Thebes, were Hephaistos' sons or grandsons.¹⁸ In the play, Philoktetes wishes to perish in 'the fire famously called Lemnian' (800, cf. 799–801n.), and also invokes 'the all conquering blaze wrought by Hephaistos' (986–7), which he associates with the 'Lemnian land' itself (Λημνία γῆ). When Odysseus threatens to take him by force, Philoktetes sees himself as under the protection of the land and the god: 'is this truly to be endured', he asks rhetorically, 'that [Odysseus] will take me from *your* [precincts] by force?'¹⁹ Philoktetes himself might be seen as a human version of Hephaistos: an exile on Lemnos whose identity is bound up with the natural features of the island and whose lameness is a sign of his helplessness, but who also has a special 'artistic' power, that is, as it were, the other side of this helplessness and that will manifest itself when he leaves the island.²⁰

1.4 *The myth in figurative art*

Although Philoktetes was well known in epic and lyric poetry of the archaic period, the earliest figurative representations date from the second quarter of the fifth century, and one fifth-century statue and two paintings seem to have been particularly famous. Pliny (*HN* 34.19.59) describes a bronze statue by Pythagoras

¹⁵ Romm 1992: 37. ¹⁶ Cf. Rehm 2002: 114–15, 138, Romm 1992: 35–7.

¹⁷ Lemnos is one of the few places apart from Athens where there is evidence of a cult of Hephaistos. See Burkert 1985: 167–8.

¹⁸ Burkert 1985: 167, 281. ¹⁹ For the emphasis on 'your', see 987–8n.

²⁰ For interpretation of the connection between Philoktetes' weakness, on the one hand, and his power, on the other, see Wilson 1941, Freidenberg 1997: 153–4. Morin 2003 argues for parallels between Philoktetes, Hephaistos, and Polyphemos; see below, p. 17.

of Rhegion (early-mid fifth century), which stood in Syracuse and was known as 'The Limping Man' (*Claudicans*), 'the pain of whose wound even viewers seem to feel' (*cuius ulcers dolorem sentire etiam spectantes videntur*).²¹ Lessing's suggestion that 'The Limping Man' should be identified as Philoktetes has found favour with most scholars,²² and it is tempting to identify this statue as the one described in an anonymous epigram (*AP* 16.112): 'My maker was my enemy more than the Greeks, another Odysseus, | who called to mind my evil, accursed disease. | My rock, rags, blood, wound, and wretchedness were not enough: | but he actually worked into the bronze even my pain.'

Two fifth-century paintings of *Philoktetes* are mentioned by later writers. One, by Aristophon, the brother of Polygnotos, found favour with Plutarch for giving pleasure through the excellence with which it represented pain.²³ The other, by Parrhasios, seems to have inspired epigrams by Glaukos ('in [Philoktetes'] parched eyes a tear dwells | mutely, and the wasting pain is within him', *AP* 16.111.3-4, tr. D. Page) and by Julianus, ('[Philoktetes] makes clear to all | his pain, even when they gaze from far off. | He has his hair wildly combed; look here at the locks | on his temples, matted, in harsh colours; | he has his skin parched and shrivelled to look at, | and perhaps dry to the hands' touch; | his tears stand frozen beneath his dry | eyes, a sign of (his) sleepless misery' (*AP* 16.113.1-8). In addition to these two paintings, Pausanias (1.22.6) describes another in the Picture Gallery of the Propylaia in Athens (possibly by Polygnotos himself, the text is vague), which showed Odysseus stealing the bow of Philoktetes on Lemnos (as in Aischylos) and Diomedes stealing the statue of Athena (the Palladion) from Troy.²⁴

Vase painters represented Philoktetes frequently, and he appears on coins, gems, and mirrors and in other media from c. 460 BCE through to the third century CE.²⁵ He is usually depicted at specific moments of what might be called the standard mythological narrative. In the earliest examples (460-450), he is shown as Herakles' young attendant at his death and apotheosis (*LIMC* 3, 4, 10), and he sometimes holds a bow and quiver as Herakles leaves by chariot over his pyre (*LIMC* 8, 9). In other fifth- and fourth-century depictions, he is present when Herakles sacrifices to the goddess Chryse on his expedition against Troy

²¹ The notion that the suffering shown in the statue could give rise to sympathetic pain in the viewer is in accordance with the comment by Pliny (*loc. cit.*) that Pythagoras 'was the first [sculptor] to express the nerves and the veins' (*primus nervos et venas expressit*).

²² Lessing 1990: 30 = Lessing 1984: 18; cf. Milani 1879: 53-4, Pipili 1994: 381, M. Flashar 1999: 166-7.

²³ Plut. *How to study poetry* 18c; cf. *Sympotic questions*. 5.1., where Plutarch mentions a painting of Philoktetes but does not name the artist.

²⁴ Paus. 1.22.6. The Greek can also be construed in such a way that Diomedes is stealing the bow (in accordance with the Cyclic version of the myth) and Odysseus, the statue of Athena: . . . Διομήδης ἦν καὶ Ὀδυσσεύς, ὁ μὲν ἐν Λήμνῳ τὸ Φιλοκτῆτος τόξον, ὁ δὲ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐξ Ἰλίου.

²⁵ Cf. Pipili 1994: 176-88, M. Flashar 1999: 141-67, Milani 1879: 51-110, 1882.

(*LIMC* s.v. Chryse 1–5) or in the garden of the Hesperides (*LIMC* 2); he is being bitten by the snake while sacrificing to Chryse on the way to Troy with the army led by Agamemnon and Menelaos (*LIMC* 12, 13); or he is alone on Lemnos, seated (*LIMC* 21, 22, 23) or leaning on a stick as he walks (*LIMC* 38). He also is represented on Lemnos with Odysseus, who is accompanied by either Diomedes or Neoptolemos and in one case by Athena (*LIMC* 55, 56), or he is shown being healed at Troy (*LIMC* 72, 73).

2 THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Philoktetes was first produced in the tragic competition at the City Dionysia in March 409, in the twenty-second year of the Peloponnesian War, two years after the oligarchical *coup d'état* of 411 and less than a year after the restoration of the democracy in 410. It was one of the four plays that finished first in the competition; the names and subjects of the other three plays are unknown. The City Dionysia of 409, the first to take place after the restoration of the democracy, was especially charged politically, because for the first time in Athenian history gold crowns were awarded to individual civic benefactors as part of the proceedings. The recipients were Thrasyboulos of Kalydon and Apollodoros of Megara, who had assassinated Phrynichos, a leader of the short-lived oligarchy. The decree of the *boulē* and the *dēmos* (*IG*³ 102) praises Thrasyboulos 'for being a good man toward the *dēmos* of the Athenians' and confers Athenian citizenship on him.²⁶ Shortly before the festival, perhaps on the previous day, the Athenian people swore the Oath of Demophantos, in which they promised to support the democracy and to kill anyone who wished to replace it with another form of government or to make himself tyrant.²⁷ It is even possible that the oath was sworn in the Theatre of Dionysos itself,²⁸ though other evidence suggests the *agora*.²⁹ In any event, Athenian politics of the previous two years, culminating in the oath, might well have affected the ways in which members of Sophokles' audience understood and evaluated the political actions represented in the play and the political language of its characters. The Trojan War in the play would almost inevitably have reminded an Athenian audience of the war they had been fighting with the Spartans for over two decades and which they were eager to bring to a successful conclusion.

This is not to say that the play has a straightforward relationship to Athenian politics and history, or that its characters can simply be identified with, or read as allegories for, specific Athenian politicians. The best known example of such an approach identifies the marooned Philoktetes, who is destined to help win the Trojan War, with the exiled Alkibiades, whose return to Athens was considered by

²⁶ Cf. Wilson 2009: 10–11, Shear 2011: 141–3.

²⁷ For the wording of the oath, see Andoc. 1. 96–7.

²⁸ Wilson 2009: 17–18, 24. ²⁹ Shear 2007: 157–8, 2011: 137–8.

some democrats in early 409 to be the key to winning the war, especially following his leading role in the Athenian naval victory over the Spartans at Kyzikos in 410.³⁰ It is, however, unlikely that an Athenian audience would have associated Alkibiades, the commander of an Athenian fleet since 411 and an outspoken proponent of rejecting Spartan peace overtures and continuing the war, with Philoktetes, who refuses unconditionally when asked to rejoin the Greek war effort, until he is persuaded to do so by Herakles.³¹ Moreover, Alkibiades had in fact already been recalled from exile in late 411 or early 410, and his character, as it is known from the historical record, suggests that he had more in common with the adaptable and cunning Odysseus, who has no hesitation in lying to achieve his political ends, than with Philoktetes.³² If, however, one is looking for a historical model for Odysseus rather than Philoktetes, it is more likely that the play 'draws on . . . an unsavoury array of political figures' familiar to Sophokles' audience in 409: 'Cleon, Alcibiades, Antiphon, Theramenes, Peisander . . . can all be seen in one trait or another of [Sophokles'] Odysseus, depending on the spectator's own political viewpoint'.³³ In several Euripidean tragedies of the late fifth century, Odysseus is an adaptable, opportunistic figure, a cynical 'type of the new political extremists, who, armed with sophistic rhetoric, dominated the Athenian assembly with their ferocious policies of repression and aggrandizement'.³⁴

Some members of an Athenian audience in 409 might have been reminded more generally of contemporary Athenian society and politics by diction with obvious Athenian associations:³⁵

(1) In 134, the final line of the Prologue, Odysseus speaks of Athena as 'Victory Athena the City Goddess' (Νίκη τ' Ἀθάνᾳ Πολιάς), anachronistically endowing her with cult titles that a fifth-century Athenian audience would have immediately recognized as referring to their own civic religion. 'Victory Athena' was the personification of triumphant Athenian imperialism. She was worshipped in the small temple of Athena Nike, probably built in the mid-420s and located near the southwest corner of the acropolis, just south of the entrance to the complex. 'Athena the City Goddess' (Athena Polias) was worshipped in an older cult as the protectress of the acropolis, the city of Athens, and Attica generally. She was represented by an old olive-wood statue housed in the Erechtheum, the temple on the north side of the acropolis that was still under construction in 409. The effect of Odysseus' invocation of 'Victory Athena the City Goddess' is to associate his own rhetoric, values, and intrigue (and his desire for victory everywhere and

³⁰ This identification was first proposed by Lebeau 1770: 441–3, 447.

³¹ Jameson 1956: 219. ³² Cf. Plut. *Alc.* 23.4; Jameson 1956: 219 with 225n.19.

³³ Jameson 1956: 219. Cf. Bowie 1997: 56–61, who argues that the play offers 'literary refractions' of both mythological and historical figures but does not identify specific characters with specific political leaders.

³⁴ Knox 1964: 124. Odysseus plays a role in *Hecuba* and *Cyclops* and affects the action in *Trojan Women* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, though he does not actually appear in these plays. Cf. Eur. *Or.* 1404–8 and the pseudo-Euripidean *Rhesos*.

³⁵ Cf. Rehm 2002: 154–5.

by any means, cf. 1049–54) with the rhetoric, values, and actions of contemporary Athens.

(2) At 99, Odysseus comments that ‘speech, not actions, controls everything’ (τὴν γλῶσσαν, οὐχὶ τᾶργα, πᾶνθ’ ἡγούμενην). The scholiast on this line suggests that in 96–9 Sophokles ‘slanders (διαβάλλει) contemporary Athenian political leaders (ρήτορας) as succeeding in all things through speech’. Cf. 96–9n.

(3) At 385 Philoktetes refers to the commanders of the army as ‘those in office’ (τοὺς ἐν τέλει), and Neoptolemos uses the same expression at 925, when he says, ‘Both what is just and what is expedient make | me heed those in office’. οἱ ἐν τέλει (‘those in office’ or ‘those in [highest] authority’) was a standard way of referring to high governmental officials in Athens and other city-states in the classical period.

(4) At 385–8, after saying that he does not blame Odysseus as much as ‘those in office’, Neoptolemos explains (386 γάρ) that ‘the whole city belongs to (its) leaders] | and the whole army, and those mortals who are disorderly | become bad by (their) teachers’ words’. In effect Neoptolemos anachronistically associates the Greek army (λαός) with the politics of a democratic ‘city’ (πόλις); the notion that people become ‘bad’ through the words of their teachers pointedly evokes democratic Athens, where demagogues instructed and controlled the people through their oratory. Cf. 385–8n., 385n.

(5) Odysseus’ assertion at 109 that lying is not shameful, if it leads to ‘salvation’ (σωθῆναι), and the thematic emphasis on salvation throughout the play call to mind the use of σωτηρία as a political slogan in Athens in the years after the Sicilian expedition and immediately preceding the production of *Philoktetes*.³⁶ In the play, σώιζω and related words have different meanings when used by different characters; if Odysseus is to be associated with contemporary democratic leaders, the defeat of his notion of ‘salvation’ might have resonated for Sophokles’ audience with the contemporary, anti-democratic use of the term.³⁷

(6) Herakles’ intervention at the end of the play would have been especially meaningful for a late fifth-century Athenian audience familiar with his legendary initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries and his worship in Attica as a cult-hero who ‘wards off harm’ (Ἀλεξίκακος) and in other cities as a ‘saviour’ (Σωτήρ).³⁸ His announcement that he will send Asklepios to Troy to heal Philoktetes might have been particularly resonant for an Athenian audience, because the worship of Asklepios had been imported into Athens only a decade earlier, c. 420, and his newly constructed temple stood on the south slope of the acropolis, not far from the Theatre of Dionysos.³⁹

³⁶ Cf. Bieler 1951.

³⁷ For comic reflections of the slogan, cf. *Ar. Lys.* 30, 46, 497–9, 501; *Ran.* 378 (with Dover’s comment), 1433, 1436, 1448, 1450, 1501.

³⁸ Cf. Greengard 1987: 90–3, below, p. 29.

³⁹ Cf. Mitchell-Boyask 2007: 101–2. One might add another Athenian allusion in the play that is less directly political: at 1327–8 Neoptolemos describes the snake that bit

3 SETTING

In the fifth-century Theatre of Dionysos, the visible setting of *Philoktetes* would have contributed to its dramatic effect on the audience and the play's meanings. This has been true in all performances of the play since then, in theatrical and other settings, but as the work was written for a particular theatrical space and conventions of performance, visualizing its original setting enables readers to experience the play with heightened pleasure and understanding. Most extant Attic tragedies take place in a relatively enclosed setting, before a palace or temple, but *Philoktetes* takes place in a harsh, isolated landscape, in which the main character has lived for nine years in utter isolation as an outcast from society. It projects a conspicuous agreement of situation and character which demands and repays interpretation, as do *Philoktetes*' visible and constantly frustrated efforts to leave what is virtually a prison.

Sophokles sets his play on the rocky, northeast coast of the uninhabited island, Lemnos, near Mt Hermaion. The *mise-en-scène* is clear from lines 1–29: *Philoktetes*' two-mouthed rock-cave opens into a steep cliff that rises above the shore (16–19, 27). A door in the centre of the elevated stage building (*skēnē*) represents one mouth, which faces the sea and is visible to the audience but not to a character standing on the shore (cf. 28). The other mouth, at the far end of *Philoktetes*' tunnel-like dwelling (cf. 19 ἀμφιπρήτος αὐλίου), is invisible and understood to give access to the land on the other side of the cliff.⁴⁰ The cave is located high enough that *Philoktetes* can threaten to jump from it to his death on the rocks below (1001–2). The rock-cave is the most important landscape feature of the play, emblematic of *Philoktetes*' harsh, primitive existence.⁴¹

It is unclear just how the *skēnē* was constructed, but the arrangement was highly unusual, to judge by the other surviving fifth-century tragedies.⁴² Instead of one or two doors at the same height as the low platform or stage at the back of the *orchestra*, on which the characters stood and spoke when they were

Philoktetes as οἰκουρῶν ὄφις ('indwelling serpent'), using a quasi-technical term that designated the sacred serpent dwelling in the Erechtheum (cf. *Ar. Lys.* 759, *Hdt.* 8.41.2, *Paus.* 1.24.7). This serpent, which represented the mythical, autochthonous King Erichthonios, guarded the temple and its cult-goddess.

⁴⁰ Cf. Woodhouse 1912: 241–2, Dale 1969: 127–8, Webster 1970: 8, Taplin 1978: 47, 1987: 72n.11, Kamerbeek 1980: 10, Seale 1982: 27. Some editors and interpreters think that there were two openings in the *skēnē*, both visible to the audience, which represented the two mouths of the cave, e.g. Robinson 1969: 34–41, Fusillo: 1990: 31, Davidson 1990: 313–15, Di Benedetto and Medda 1997: 117.

⁴¹ Dale 1969: 127n.1 and Webster 1970: 8 imagine the cave and its opening elevated somewhat above the *orchestra* atop the half-projecting *ekkyklēma* (a wheeled platform that could be 'rolled out' from the *skēnē* and normally was used in the fifth-century Theatre of Dionysos to make interior scenes visible to the audience). Mastronarde 1990: 285 assumes 'a slightly raised cave opening constructed at the central door (this could, but need not, have been built on the projected *ekkyklēma*)'.

⁴² Though Soph.'s *OC*, with its distinctive landscape features, Aesch.'s *PV*, and Eur.'s *Andromeda*, set on a rocky seashore, must have had similarly unusual scenic arrangements.

not using the *orchēstra*,⁴³ the 'door' of the *skēnē* was the elevated cave-mouth, in front of which there was a small open area or platform large enough for several characters. There was probably not yet a permanent stage building in the Theatre of Dionysos when *Philoktetes* was first produced; presumably, a temporary, wooden building (which must have been used with suitable adaptation by all competing playwrights in a given festival) had painted panels or drapes that gave the illusion of rocks (and were perhaps supplemented with real rocks). Probably another platform, a precursor of the later *theologeion*, projected toward the *orchēstra* from the flat roof of the *skēnē*, Herakles speaks to Philoktetes and Neoptolemos from this platform or from the roof itself at 1409–51. He could have been brought to the roof by the *mēchanē*, a crane used in the fifth- and fourth-century theatre to lift gods onto the stage as if from above, especially when they appeared suddenly to redirect the dramatic action at the end of a play (cf. 1409–17n.).⁴⁴

4 STAGING

A distinctive spatial feature of *Philoktetes* is the use of only one of the two *eisodoi* leading into the *orchēstra*, probably the one on the audience's left, which is understood as leading to and from the ship. The other *eisodos* is imagined as leading to a different part of the coast or to the interior of the island, but neither the Chorus nor the characters enter from or exit in that direction.⁴⁵ The *eisodos* to and from the ship, however, is constantly 'used, not used, about to be used and half-used . . . during the course of the play'.⁴⁶ Not only do Odysseus, Neoptolemos, and the False Merchant arrive and depart one, two, or three at a time, but at different times Neoptolemos or Neoptolemos and Philoktetes begin to leave, only to have their departures frustrated in some way (e.g. at 467, 526–38, 645, 730, 894, 1408). The play repeatedly calls attention to this *eisodos*, thereby reminding an audience or reader that Philoktetes himself, since being marooned on the island, has gone nowhere for nine years and that, as the play proceeds, his only options are to join the others on the path that leads toward the ship and Troy, or not to join them and to remain on the island. The single means of entrance and exit contributes visually to the sense that Philoktetes is trapped on the island, unless he is willing to rejoin and help those who marooned him there in the first place.

⁴³ It is not certain that such a stage, which was a feature of the Theatre of Dionysos in later times, existed in the late fifth century, but vase paintings of scenes from comedy suggest that it did. See Csapo and Slater 1994: 64, 66, 80, 268. For the actors using the *orchēstra*, see Ley and Ewans 1985.

⁴⁴ Seale 1982: 54n.56 thinks that Herakles reached the roof and departed by concealed stairs, but cf. Mastronarde 1990: 271n.68 on the probable use of the *mēchanē*.

⁴⁵ Those scholars who think that both mouths of the cave are visible to the audience assume that Phil.'s first entry is made along the *eisodos* on the audience's right. Cf. 219–53n.

⁴⁶ Taplin 1987: 72.

Nevertheless, for Philoktetes the world outside Lemnos is dramatically present throughout the play:⁴⁷ Odysseus and Neoptolemos have come to bring him to Troy, Philoktetes imagines returning home (490–2, 1399), and the Chorus sing of Neoptolemos bringing him to Malis and the banks of the Spercheios (721–9). Neoptolemos tells Philoktetes that he has reached Lemnos while sailing home to Skyros (239–40). Similarly, the False Merchant claims to have reached Lemnos on the way home from Troy to Peparethos (548–9), and he speaks of Phoinix and the sons of Theseus as having left Troy in pursuit of Neoptolemos (561–2, 570–1) and of Diomedes and Odysseus as *en route* from Troy to Lemnos (591–3). These intended or pretended movements serve mainly to emphasize, by contrast, Philoktetes' inability for most of the play to go anywhere, except from his cave to the shore. They call attention to the gap between his longing and the reality imposed upon him by the actions of others and by his own refusal to leave, if this means helping his hated enemies.

5 INTERTEXTS

5.1 *Philoktetes and Homeric epic*

Philoktetes alludes with conspicuous frequency to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* through verbal echoes and by adapting narrative patterns for its own poetic purposes. These allusions help to generate a contrast within the play between epic and tragic versions of Achilles and Odysseus, as well as a contrast between what might be considered Philoktetes' Achillean and Odyssean selves. This intertextuality with the Homeric epics contributes significantly to the play's generic complexity and ethical ambiguity; it challenges audiences and readers to make sense of opposed epic paradigms and values and of contradictions between these traditional paradigms and values and those of late fifth-century Athens.⁴⁸

Philoktetes' association with an Iliadic/Achillean heroic paradigm is made clear by his uncompromising refusal to yield to the persuasion and deception of Agamemnon's emissary, Odysseus, a refusal that calls to mind Achilles' similar refusal in Book 9 of the *Iliad*.⁴⁹ Moreover, when Neoptolemos, the son of Achilles, in effect chooses Philoktetes over Odysseus as a 'father figure', he associates Philoktetes with Achilles as a particular kind of hero whose inborn nobility is the source of his ethical power.⁵⁰ Yet this Iliadic heroic model is complemented and complicated by the simultaneous association of Philoktetes with the epic Odysseus. Philoktetes' experience in the course of the play recalls the typical adventure of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* – trapped on a remote island, until he

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 72–3. ⁴⁸ Cf. Schein 2006.

⁴⁹ Cf. Knox 1964: 52, Schlesinger 1968: 103–5, Beye 1970, Fuqua 1976: 49–50.

⁵⁰ On Neoptolemos' choice of a 'father figure', cf. Avery 1965, Whitby 1996: 39, Roisman 1997: 127–8, Kosak 1999: 115, 125–8, Davidson 1995.

escapes from the danger of a literal or symbolic death and returns home to slay the suitors and re-establish his distinctive heroic identity. As Odysseus on Ogygia is represented as symbolically dead in a virtual Land of the Dead,⁵¹ so Philoktetes on Lemnos is 'a corpse among the living' (1018) and 'the shadow of smoke, merely an image' (946–7), who cannot understand why the Greeks would want him back – 'I who am nothing and as far as [they] are concerned have been dead for a long time' (1030). In addition, Philoktetes' eventual departure from the 'sea-encircled land of Lemnos' (1464) and 'return home' (1471) to health and heroic identity at Troy recall Odysseus' repeated triumphs over the danger of real or symbolic death and oblivion and successful *nostos*.⁵²

The situational parallels between Philoktetes and the epic Odysseus are striking, because a less favourable presentation of Odysseus would have been familiar to Sophokles' audience from Cyclic epic, for example in the Palamedes story, which figured prominently in Euripides' *Philoktetes*. Furthermore, as commentators since antiquity have noticed, Odysseus in the play is characterized not as his Homeric self but as a type of late fifth-century Athenian political leader, ready and willing to lie for the sake of personal profit and the needs of his community, the army (111), and to use physical violence in order to gain control of Philoktetes and his bow (see below, p. 21). The contrast in *Philoktetes* between this fifth-century Odysseus and the Odysseus of the *Odyssey* is signalled on several occasions, when Philoktetes refers to Odysseus as the son of Sisyphe rather than the son of Laertes (417, 1311; cf. 625), and when Odysseus anachronistically invokes his patron goddess in the *Odyssey* as 'Victory Athena the City Goddess' (above, p. 11; cf. 134n.). Thus, in addition to the contrast between the fifth-century, tragic Odysseus and Odysseus of the *Odyssey*, the play also offers a contrast between the fifth-century Odysseus and Philoktetes, whose movement from symbolic death to rebirth and *nostos* associate him with the epic Odysseus.

There is a similar contrast between the Iliadic Achilles, whom Philoktetes resembles in his self-defeating refusal to compromise with his hated enemies and his need and capacity for friendship, and a fifth-century, tragic Achilles in the person of Neoptolemos, though treatments by the Cyclic poets and in Attic tragedy had already complicated the relatively straightforward and idealized Homeric hero.⁵³ Neoptolemos' solidarity with Philoktetes is initially grounded in Philoktetes' old friendship with Achilles (cf. 242), and Neoptolemos' betrayal of this solidarity is, in a way, a betrayal both of his father and of his father-son relationship with Philoktetes. Even earlier in the play, when Neoptolemos abandons his sense of shame (120) for the sake of personal profit (112), he makes clear the distance between Achilles as depicted in the *Iliad* and himself.

⁵¹ Schein 1996: 22–3 with 23.n.41. ⁵² See Frame 1978: 1–80.

⁵³ For the negative image of Neoptolemos in Cyclic epic and Attic tragedy, see below, p. 23.

5.2 *Philoktetes and the Kyklops in Homer and Euripides*

The interpretation of *Philoktetes* is complicated by an additional pattern of intertextuality, which associates Philoktetes not with Achilles or Odysseus but with one of Odysseus' victims, the Kyklops, Polyphemos. At 144–5 Neoptolemos speaks of the place where Philoktetes dwells (κεῖται) as located in the ἐσχάτιας, 'the extreme parts' of the island, which is also the location of Polyphemos' dwelling at *Od.* 9.182.⁵⁴ The similarity, however, between Philoktetes' existence and that of the Kyklops is not just a matter of location. It is underlined elsewhere in the play by the detail that each of them lives in a cave and by descriptions of Philoktetes as having become 'savage' (226 ἀπηγριωμένον, 1321 σὺ δ' ἡγρίωσαι), and references to Philoktetes' food in language appropriate to that of animals (43, 162, 707, 711, 1108 φορβή, 274, 308 βορά) recall the Kyklops' savage eating of Odysseus' companions at *Od.* 9.291–3, 311, 344. In addition, Neoptolemos' description of the contents of the cave (32–9) and Philoktetes' own account of his way of life (287–97) suggest a technologically primitive existence like that of Polyphemos in *Odyssey* 9. Yet the apparent similarity between the two figures is somewhat misleading. Neoptolemos uses the word ἐσχάτιας before he encounters Philoktetes, perhaps under the influence of what he has seen in the cave, but he no longer speaks this way when he has actually met Philoktetes, who turns out to be neither savage, except in appearance, nor antisocial, even though he has been exiled from human society. The descriptions of Philoktetes' life on Lemnos have been thought to reflect fifth-century ideas on pre-civilized human existence,⁵⁵ but he himself is neither pre-civilized nor uncivilized, like Polyphemos in the *Odyssey*.⁵⁶

The association of Philoktetes with the Kyklops is strengthened by the use of some of the same language to describe Philoktetes' rock-cave and the cave of Polyphemos in Euripides' *Kyklops*.⁵⁷ The two plays share other diction as well, e.g. the aorist of κατέχω used in the sense 'put into shore' (*Ph.* 221, *Cyc.* 223, 349), and ἔρημος and ἐρημία used of the isolated existence about which Philoktetes repeatedly complains in Sophokles' play, as do Silenos and the Chorus in Euripides' (*Ph.* 228, 265, 471, 487, 1018, 1070; *Cyc.* 22, 622). Such similarities

⁵⁴ Elsewhere, ἐσχάτια can denote the 'wild countryside' at the farthest limit of the rural area surrounding a community (Vidal-Naquet 1988: 165–6) or be used as the equivalent of τὰ ἐσχάτα τῆς γῆς (Hdt. 3.106.1, 116.3), denoting the extremities of the earth (Romm 1992: 38–9). Cf. 144–6n.

⁵⁵ Segal 1981: 292 with 468n.1, 296.

⁵⁶ Several scholars, building in part on resemblances between Philoktetes and Polyphemos, have seen in Philoktetes a survival of the widespread folkloric figure of the 'wild man' or 'savage man', who is defeated by his civilized visitor, the questing hero. Cf. Davies 2003, Finglass 2006, and, with differences of emphasis, Brillante 2009.

⁵⁷ Cf. 17–19n. Seaford 1984: 225, on Eur. *Cyc.* 706–7, sees *Cyc.* 707 δι' ἀμφιτρήτος τῆσδε as 'a burlesque' of S. *Ph.* 19 δι' ἀμφιτρήτος αὐλίου, and tentatively dates Euripides' play to 408 BCE, a year after the production of *Philoktetes* (Seaford 1984: 48–9, Seaford 1982: 163–72). If this is correct, Euripides' audience might have been expected to recognize the verbal echoes and the relationship between the caves in the two plays.

of diction, however, are hard to evaluate, when so few plays survive complete. Philoktetes shows none of the hostility to society in general that the Euripidean Polyphemos expresses, only to the army as commanded by the sons of Atreus; nor does he have the Kyklops' anti-democratic, selfish concern for his own wealth and pleasure. Furthermore, though Odysseus is characterized in both plays as a sophistically tinged author of intrigue, who recalls, in his language and values, contemporary Athenian political leaders, the intrigue and characterization in *Cyc.* are in a different key generically and do not raise the kind of ethical problems that they raise in *Philoktetes*.

6 THE CHORUS AND THE CHARACTERS

6.1 *The Chorus*

Unlike most Sophoklean choruses, whose odes move from specific events of the play to general reflections and situate the events in a larger intellectual or religious framework, the Chorus in *Philoktetes* are intimately tied to the dramatic action, in which they play a part as 'one of the actors' in the Sophoklean (as opposed to Euripidean) manner recommended by Aristotle at *Poetics* 18.1456a25–7.⁵⁸ They sing only one fully developed stasimon (676–729). Their entry-song consists of a dialogue between the Chorus and Neoptolemos; lines 391–402 correspond metrically with 507–18, but the separation of strophe and antistrophe by over 100 lines makes them seem more like lyric outbursts than a coherent song, even though they are closely linked thematically; and there are *kommoi* in place of choral songs at 827–64 and 1081–1217. Throughout the play the Chorus cooperate in Odysseus' intrigue against Philoktetes as Neoptolemos' subordinate. From their first words they make clear that they are willing to conceal or speak out against the 'suspicious man' (136), to serve Neoptolemos as necessary (142–3), and to 'watch out for the moment that is especially critical [for him]' (151). They associate themselves with his opportunistic falsehoods at 391–402, when they invoke 'all-nourishing mountain-goddess Earth' in support of Neoptolemos' lying story that he was robbed of his father's arms, and at 507–18, when they try to assist Neoptolemos by wishing that they could bring Philoktetes home, 'escaping | the righteous anger of the gods' (517–18). In both stanzas they exploit divinity for their own rhetorical purposes, and raise questions about the gods' relationship to human morality, questions that surface elsewhere in the play in the prophecy of Helenos; in Philoktetes' rhetorical question at 450–2, 'How | should I understand these things, how praise them, when | praising the gods' actions I find the gods evil?'; in Odysseus' insistence at 993 that by his actions he 'make[s] the gods true'; and in Herakles' claim to speak for Zeus (1415) and later

⁵⁸ *Contra* Gardiner 1987: 13 and Müller 1967: 217, who see the Chorus in *Philoktetes* as dramatically typical of Sophoklean choruses. Cf. Goldhill 2012: 119–31.

warning that Philoktetes and Neoptolemos should 'be pious in things having to do with the gods', when they sack Troy, since 'father Zeus considers everything else secondary' (1440-3).

At 837-8, the Chorus recommend, in Odyssean fashion, that Neoptolemos steal Philoktetes' bow and leave. When Neoptolemos rejects this advice on the grounds that Philoktetes must himself come to Troy and that 'it's an infamous shame to boast with falsehoods of things unaccomplished' (842), the Chorus remark blandly that 'a god will see to this' (843) and persist in urging Neoptolemos to act 'secretly' (850). Later they defend the deception of Philoktetes as simply the duty of a representative of the army (cf. 1143-5n.), and after the deception has been revealed, they themselves try to persuade Philoktetes to accompany them to Troy.

The Chorus, to be sure, are sympathetic to Philoktetes: even before they meet him, they pity him (169-80, cf. 676-717), and the solidarity they express in the second *kommós* is genuine. They are, however, 'sympathetic realists' in whom a 'combination of weak pity and strong self-interest' is predominant;⁵⁹ they are perfectly capable of blaming the victim for his own misfortune: 'it was you, heavy doomed man, you, who brought it about, | this fortune comes not from another . . . | . . . | rather than a better fate you chose to approve what is worse' (1095-1100). When Philoktetes replies that 'unlooked for, hidden | words of a treacherous mind stole upon me' (1111-12), the Chorus are concerned only to exclude themselves from blame: 'this is doom, doom from the gods, nor did treachery | by my hand take hold (of you). Aim your hateful | curse of bitter doom against others. This is my concern, | that you not reject my friendship' (1116-22). The Chorus are not alone in their 'friendship' or their attribution of Philoktetes' doom to the gods: Neoptolemos had precisely the same thought (191-200). The difference, however, is that his view changes in the course of the play, while theirs remains constant,⁶⁰ and their exclusion from the human and divine solidarities with which the play ends is striking.

Unlike other Sophoklean choruses, the Chorus in *Philoktetes* rarely rise to a higher intellectual, speculative, or spiritual level; except in their expressions of pity for Philoktetes in (169-90, 681-717), they do not provide a 'choral' voice with which the audience can associate themselves or make a point of departure for their own thoughts. Rather, insofar as the audience might 'identify' with the Chorus (as one collectivity with another), they too participate in the intrigue. It is characteristic of *Philoktetes* that it often is impossible to distinguish truth from falsehood in what the characters say.⁶¹ In another play the Chorus might clarify or interpret such ambiguities. Here, however, their role as 'one of the actors'

⁵⁹ Winnington-Ingram 1980: 294n.44. The language in which they express their pity (169 οἰκτίρω, 186 οἰκτρός) does not imply that they will act on it; cf. Frauscello 2010.

⁶⁰ Winnington-Ingram 1980: 294n.44.

⁶¹ Cf. Greengard 1987: 5-6, 23-7, 100-2, Encinas Reguero 2011: 84-5, 102-3.

leaves things unclear and contributes to the lack of any consolatory, enlightening, or uplifting perspective on the play's events and values.

6.2 *Odysseus*

Odysseus is completely excluded from the play's 'happy ending': he exits ignominiously shortly after his empty threat to 'convey' Philoktetes to Troy 'by force, | whether or not the son of Achilles wishes' (1297–8), and he never reappears and is not even mentioned by Herakles in the final scene. Nevertheless, when Philoktetes agrees to join the army and help bring about the sack of Troy, it is clear that Odysseus gets what he wanted all along, and getting what he wanted may be enough for one whose stated ambition is 'victory in all things' (1052, cf. 81). Although Herakles declares (as Odysseus had done earlier) that only Philoktetes and Neoptolemos together 'have the strength to take the plain of Troy' (1434–5; cf. 115), a spectator or reader would remember that in the *Odyssey* and the mythological tradition generally, Odysseus is 'the sacker of cities' *par excellence*.

More than any other character, Odysseus brings into the play the political and moral world of late fifth-century Athens, as it is described and represented by Thucydides (see above, pp. 10–12). His emphasis on lying as the only way to get possession of Philoktetes' bow recalls Diodotos' statement in Thucydides' Mytilenean debate that lies are a normal part of political discourse – 'that it is equally necessary that the man arguing for the most terrible proposals win over the people by deceit and the man with better advice make himself trusted by lying' (3.43.2).⁶² Given this position of straightforward realpolitik, Neoptolemos' hesitation to deceive Philoktetes by lying, until Odysseus persuades him to do so (86–120), makes the son of Achilles seem exceptionally innocent politically.⁶³

Thucydides comments that among the changes in the social and moral fabric brought about by the revolutions and civil conflicts that arose throughout Greece during the Peloponnesian War, 'the simplicity (τὸ εὐθές) that is especially found in noble natures disappeared because it became ridiculous' (3.83.1). In the world he describes, 'nature' is not a matter of inherited nobility, innocence, or excellence, as Neoptolemos seems to believe when he uses these terms (e.g. 88–9), but of an inborn disposition toward brutality and exploitation, grounded in an appetite for victory at all costs that stems, in turn, from acquisitiveness and personal ambition (3.82.8). This is a world in which Sophokles' Odysseus would be at home. It is no accident that Odysseus uses the word 'noble' both seductively at 50, to convince Neoptolemos to 'be of service' in 'steal[ing] Philoktetes' soul with words' (51, 53), and sarcastically at 1068, to prevent him from feeling too much sympathy for Philoktetes, 'so you won't ruin our good fortune' (1069).

⁶² All translations of Thucydides are taken from Lattimore 1998.

⁶³ The Thucydidean term is εὐήθης ('of good character', 'naïve').

One feature of Odysseus' rhetorical style, which he shares with many speakers in Thucydides, is the tendency to explain or justify his own and others' actions and desires by invoking some impersonal, supposedly objective necessity (e.g. 50–7, 993–4); Neoptolemos uses similar arguments and language when he is acting as Odysseus' agent (e.g. 116, 915, 921–2).⁶⁴ Another feature, related to Odysseus' political role as the representative of the Greek army at Troy, is his frequent use of the language of physical force.⁶⁵ Odysseus is referred to three times in the play (314, 321, 592), by a kind of naming periphrasis familiar from Homeric epic, as 'the violence of Odysseus' (Ὀδυσσεύως βία). This periphrasis, however, is never used of Odysseus himself in Homer, which makes it all the more striking that he should be named in this way in the play.⁶⁶ The association of violence with Odysseus in this Homeric manner is similarly striking, because in Homeric epic Odysseus is notable for mentality (νόος) and cunning intelligence (μητις), with a penchant for treacherous deceit (δόλος). In *Philoktetes*, the word μητις does not occur, and the word νόος is not used of Odysseus, but he is still a figure of treacherous deceit (δόλος, ἀπάτη), and cleverness (cf. σοφός, σόφισμα). These mental qualities, however, are associated with, not opposed to, physical violence.

The emphasis on Odysseus' violence may be a function of the loose association of the Trojan War in the play with the Peloponnesian War. Both Neoptolemos, in his false persona (563), and Philoktetes (945–6) speak indignantly of Odysseus' or the Greeks' intention to 'bring' them 'by force' to participate in the war, using an idiom, ἐκ βίας ἄγειν, that occurs nowhere else in extant Sophoklean drama and seems to be associated in *Philoktetes* specifically with the war effort. Thucydides' comment on civil conflict in the Peloponnesian War, 'War is a violent teacher and brings most men's passions into line with the present situations' (ὁ δὲ πόλεμος . . . βίαιος διδάσκαλος καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ, 3.82.2), might aptly describe Odysseus' opportunistic actions and intrigue during the play.

Odysseus actually becomes more violent as the play progresses. At the beginning, when Neoptolemos is reluctant to lie but willing to bring Philoktetes by force (90, 92 πρὸς βίαν), Odysseus says that this approach will not work (103). Later, however, he has his men seize Philoktetes (1003) and twice threatens to have him brought to Troy by force (984, 1297). Intra-communal violence was a fundamental feature of Athenian political reality in the years immediately preceding the production of *Philoktetes* (above, p. 10), and Odysseus' readiness to use violence to achieve personal and political ends associates him with contemporary political leaders.

⁶⁴ Cf. 50–1n., Schein 1998: 295, 296, 301–5. By contrast, χρή and related words normally refer to subjective, 'internally based' needs, requirements, and constraints. See Barrett 1964: 164–5, Benardete 1965. Verbal adjectives can also be used to specify a practical or immediate need or requirement, if something is to be accomplished.

⁶⁵ Cf. Schein 2002.

⁶⁶ There is only one similar periphrasis elsewhere in surviving Sophoklean drama, *Tr.* 381φίτου βίαν.

Another 'fifth-century' feature of Odysseus' style is his conspicuous use of language that calls to mind the Sophistic movement and values that are opposed to the traditional conceptions of 'nobility' and 'nature' associated with Neoptolemos and Achilles.⁶⁷ At 77–80, for example, Odysseus tells Neoptolemos, 'No, this is just the thing in which you must be clever; so you | may become the thief of the invincible weapons. | I know well, my son, that by nature you were not born | to contrive such things or utter such evils.' The verbs 'to be clever' (77 σοφισθῆναι) and 'to contrive' (80 τεχνᾶσθαι) imply learning and knowing how to use an acquired craft or technique, as opposed to acting naturally. The Sophists taught their students to apply such know-how in different ways on different occasions, in order to achieve their social and political goals. On the other hand, traditional qualities such as 'nobility' or 'honour' would always dictate the same behaviour, regardless of the specific occasion or circumstances.⁶⁸

At 126–31, Odysseus says that if Neoptolemos seems to be taking too long in his deception of Philoktetes, he will send back the 'lookout' (σκοπός) who accompanied them (in the Prologue), and that 'from him, as he speaks craftily (ποικίλως)', Neoptolemos should 'receive | what is advantageous in his words on each occasion'. 'What is advantageous' (131 τὰ συμφέροντα), though not a specifically Sophistic term, can be used sophistically because it has no fixed meaning; rather, it is inherently relativistic, since 'what is advantageous' varies in varying circumstances. It may stand in contrast to 'what is just', but it also can be identified with justice, as in the first book of Plato's *Republic*, where the Sophist Thrasymachos defines justice as 'what is advantageous for (or "in the interest of") the stronger' (τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος συμφέρον, *Pl. Rep.* 338c2). Odysseus' language and values would certainly have been recognizable to a late fifth-century Athenian audience, and are still recognizable today, as belonging to the same Sophistic world as the language of Plato's Thrasymachos. The power to have his own way and to do what will be to his advantage (and that of the army he represents) are all the justification Odysseus needs for his deceitful words, intrigue, and instrumental exploitation of Philoktetes (and Neoptolemos).⁶⁹

At 81–5, in urging Neoptolemos to deceive Philoktetes, Odysseus says, 'Since . . . the possession of victory is something sweet to gain, | bring yourself to do it; we shall appear just on another occasion. | Give yourself to me now for a shameless purpose, | for a brief part of a day, and then for the rest of time | be called the most pious of all mortals.' Odysseus can casually defer such basic virtues as justice and righteousness to another occasion, for what matters, in his

⁶⁷ Cf. Worman 1999, 2002: 139–48, Blundell 1987. Rose 1992: 266–330 discusses *Philoktetes* as a sophistic 'counter-offensive' against the Sophists, as well as the conflict between traditional and Sophistic values in the play.

⁶⁸ For other sophistic language in the Prologue, cf. 13–14n., 80n.

⁶⁹ For the clearest example in the play of Odysseus' amoral relativism, see 1049–52 with 1049–53n.

view, is only to *appear* just and to *be called* ‘most righteous’, not ‘justice’ and ‘righteousness’ in some fixed sense. His goal is to be effective, as and when needed, and his emphasis on the critical moment (cf. 12 ἀκμή, 131 τῶν ἀεὶ λόγων) is one aspect of his amoral opportunism and one feature of the Sophistic rhetoric and style that would have evoked for the play’s original audience their own political leaders.

6.3 *Neoptolemos*

Sophokles gives his play remarkable dramatic and ethical complexity by introducing Neoptolemos into the story of the retrieval of Philoktetes from Lemnos. In this way he creates a contrast between innocence and experience in the realm of politics, a critique of traditional conceptions of nobility and heroism that seems to go beyond anything that might have transpired in the Philoktetes-plays of Aischylos and Euripides, and an example of character development and change of mind that is rare in surviving Greek literature.⁷⁰ Neoptolemos’ transformation would have been surprising to an Athenian audience, because in traditional mythology and earlier Attic tragedies he is regularly associated with gruesome, inhumane cruelty: during the sack of Troy he butchers Priam on the altar of Zeus;⁷¹ after the sack of the city he throws Astyanax from the walls of Troy (or allows him to be thrown),⁷² then sacrifices Polyxena to the *psuchē* of his father, Achilles.⁷³ As far as is known, Neoptolemos was not directly associated with Philoktetes prior to Sophokles’ play, except that both were necessary for the sack of Troy.⁷⁴ Nor is there an earlier connection between Neoptolemos and Odysseus, apart from a reference in the *argumentum* of the Cyclic epic, *Returns* (Νόστοι), to a meeting between the two in Thracian Maroneia, shortly after the end of the Trojan War.⁷⁵

Neoptolemos proudly proclaims himself the son of Achilles and heir to his inborn, natural integrity (88–9), but Odysseus easily plays on his desire for the kind of heroic glory associated with his father – the kind of glory that would come from sacking Troy – in order to seduce him into a distinctly non-Achillean course of lying and deception that will make the sack of the city possible. Although Neoptolemos initially finds such lying and deception ‘shameful’ (108), he quickly agrees for the sake of his own profit (112) to ‘put aside all shame’ and do it (120). His professed reluctance to act ‘by evil contrivance’ (88) and preference ‘to take

⁷⁰ See Gibert 1995: 145–55, Fulkerson 2006: 56–7. Telemachos in the *Odyssey* is the obvious model for Neoptolemos’ character development, cf. Whitby 1996.

⁷¹ *Sack of Ilion, Argumentum* (Bernabé 1996: 81 = West 2003: 144–5), Apollod. *Epit.* 5.21.

⁷² *Little Iliad*, fr. 18.3–5, Paus. 10.25.9, Tzetzes, Σ on Lyc. 1263.

⁷³ Ibykos, *PMG* fr. 307; Eur. *Hec.* 565–6, cf. Mossman 1999: 142–63.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Little Iliad, argumentum*, ‘Diomedes brings back Philoktetes from Lemnos’, and ‘Odysseus brings Neoptolemos from Skyros and gives him his father’s arms’ (Bernabé 1996: 74 = West 2003: 120–1, 122–3).

⁷⁵ Bernabé 1996: 95 = West 2003: 156–7. This meeting is mentioned nowhere else in extant Greek literature.

the man by force | instead of deceit' (90–1) and 'to fail by doing well rather than to conquer by evil means' (94–5) are no match for Odysseus' paternal reassurance that speech rather than action is what prevails in life (96–9) and deft assertion that it is not shameful to lie, 'if the lie brings salvation' (109).

Neoptolemos is a remarkably successful liar, until he is so affected by the sight of Philoktetes' paroxysm that he confesses his treachery (912–16). Even then, however, the compassion that he feels and the moral quandary occasioned by the sense that he has been untrue to his 'own nature' (895, 897, 902–3, 906) do not prevent him from holding on to the bow and using the typically Odyssean language of impersonal necessity (921–2 'a great necessity | compels these things', cf. 54, 77, 982, 993–4) to justify himself to Philoktetes. Although Neoptolemos realizes that he cannot simply abandon the sleeping Philoktetes, as Odysseus had done nine years earlier (271–5), and that 'we have hunted | this bow in vain, if we sail without him' (839–40), he still sees nothing wrong with forcing Philoktetes against his will to participate in the war for the sake of the Greek army and of Neoptolemos' own glory. In effect, he continues to treat Philoktetes as a means to an end – 'the possession of victory' (81). Earlier in the play he had told the Chorus that Philoktetes' 'sufferings, if I have any understanding, | are divinely ordained' (192–3) and that 'there is no way the gods are not concerned | lest this man draw against Troy too soon | the unopposable shafts of the gods, | until the time comes in which it is said | that the city must be conquered by them' (196–200). Neoptolemos continues to make this self-serving assumption even after returning the bow, when he tells Philoktetes that his wound and sickness are a stroke of 'fortune sent by the gods' (1326) and invokes the prophecy of Helenos as a reason why Philoktetes should 'give your agreement willingly' to go to Troy, be healed, and win the 'highest glory' (1343–7).

When Neoptolemos returns the bow, Philoktetes praises him in the terms that mean the most to Neoptolemos: 'You've shown your nature, my child, the stock | from which you were born – not from Sisypheos as a father | but from Achilles . . . ' (1310–12). Nevertheless, even though Neoptolemos has escaped Odysseus' hold on him and earned Philoktetes' praise, the stability of his transformation and his ethical disposition remain ambiguous and problematic. There is a clear allusion, in Herakles' warning to remain pious during the sack of Troy (1440–4), to Neoptolemos' notorious impiety on that occasion, when he butchered Priam on the altar of Zeus,⁷⁶ and because Neoptolemos' pity and respect for Philoktetes seem, on the surface, so similar to the pity and respect of Achilles for Priam in Book 24 of the *Iliad*, the reminder of the son's ruthless impiety toward the helpless king is all the more troubling. Even the apparently positive simile in which Herakles tells Neoptolemos and Philoktetes to guard one another at Troy 'like two lions feeding in the same pasture' (1436–7) suggests, intertextually, Odysseus' ethically ambiguous behaviour during the night-spying episode in

⁷⁶ Cf. Easterling 1978: 39, Winnington-Ingram 1980: 302–3, Roberts 1988: 190–1.

Iliad 10.⁷⁷ In combination with the allusion to Neoptolemos' impious behaviour during the sack of Troy, this complex intertextuality raises new problems of interpretation just as the play seems to be moving toward its 'happy ending'. Despite Neoptolemos' apparently successful moral education into his inherent nobility, the knowledge that something in his character and destiny is warped and cannot be straightened undermines the sense that he has returned to himself and his inherited nature and values.

6.4 *Philoktetes*

The central realities of Philoktetes' existence on Lemnos are his chronic disease (*vóσos*), the shattering physical pain that comes over and through him when he suffers an outbreak of this disease, and the constant emotional pain of being cut off from his native land and from the community of the Greek army, who abandoned him rather than hear the sound of his cries and smell the stench of his body. With no one to sympathize or care for him, Philoktetes hears only the echo of his own voice in response to his cries of agony (188–90, 692–700). The paroxysm he suffers in the second episode (730–826) is only one instance of the physical pain that has come and gone for nine years in an endless cycle of suffering, which recalls that of Prometheus in a similarly harsh and isolated setting. Philoktetes' initial welcome of Neoptolemos shows that he has held on to his humanity through those years of torment, but when he suffers a paroxysm, he temporarily loses his humanity to the extent that he loses his language.⁷⁸ At these moments he can only emit a series of repeated cries and unarticulated sounds (732, 739, 745–6, 782, 785, 786, 790, 792, 793, 796). He describes the pain as something other and separate from himself, by which he is devoured (745, cf. 7), something which visits him from time to time (758–9), approaches and penetrates him (743–4, 787–8), and feeds on his flesh (795), until the intensity of the pain leaves him unable to stand, blood bursts from his wounded foot, and he is drenched in sweat and faints in a deathlike sleep (819–26). The 'frailness and vulnerability' of Philoktetes' body would presumably have horrified a fifth-century Athenian audience as it horrifies modern spectators and readers, who all have similar bodies and are similarly vulnerable.⁷⁹

Philoktetes' paroxysm is literally and figuratively at the heart of the play. Odysseus' earlier reference to his symptoms (7–11), Neoptolemos' description of rags heavy with matter discharged from his ulcerated foot (39), and the chorus' mention of his 'far off cry' and anguished 'lament' (207–9, 216–18) give some idea of Philoktetes' suffering, but nothing is as vivid and affecting as the sheer

⁷⁷ Cf. 1433–7n, Schein 2006: 138 ⁷⁸ Cf. Scarry 1985: 5.

⁷⁹ Eagleton 2003: xv argues that such 'frailty and vulnerability' is the basis of tragedy both onstage and in the real world, since tragedy is 'among other things a symbolic coming to terms with our finitude and fragility...'. Cf. Budelmann 2006, 2007, Hall 2012.

physical agony of his paroxysm. Paradoxically, this agony leads both to the final success of Odysseus' intrigue, because it causes Philoktetes to entrust his bow to Neoptolemos (766, 769–73), and to Neoptolemos' moral awakening, because he comes to pity Philoktetes' divinely inflicted suffering and feels pain at his own shameless actions.

The emotional pain resulting from Philoktetes' abandonment and isolation on Lemnos is, in its own way, as intense as his physical agony (cf. 169–75, 227–8, 280–2). When he understands that he has again been betrayed by Neoptolemos, this emotional pain intensifies, and he calls on the only 'friends' he has left, the Lemnian landscape and the animals living in it: 'O, you bays, O, you projecting headlands, O, you companionships | of wild mountain beasts, O, you steep rocks . . .' (936–7). At this point he is so utterly cut off from human contact that he becomes part of the naturally just ecology of the island: 'I myself in my misery | will die and provide a feast (for those) by whom I was fed, | and (those) whom I used to hunt before will now hunt me |; and I will pay my blood as compensation for (their) blood' (956–9).

Philoktetes describes himself as 'having become savage' (ἀπηνργιωμένον, 226) 'wasting away with a savage (ἀγρία) disease, struck by the savage (ἀγρίω) mark of the man-destroying serpent' (265–7), but when Neoptolemos tells him, σὺ δ' ἡγρίωσαι (1321), the meaning hovers between 'you have become savage' and 'you have made yourself savage' – not, Neoptolemos implies, because of the snakebite, but through unrelenting, uncompromising anger and hatred of his enemies. Even after Neoptolemos has pitied him and shown his friendship by returning the bow, Philoktetes continues to reject his friendly advice (1383–6) and still refuses to sail to Troy and rejoin the army. He is trapped in the necessities of his hatred of Odysseus and the sons of Atreus, based on what he has experienced from them in the past, which he projects into the future (1358–61); he would be ashamed to see himself associating with those who destroyed him, for this would mean doing good rather than harm to his enemies in violation of the only ethic by which he knows how to live (1354–7).

Philoktetes' intense anger, hatred, and shame not only prevail over all attempts at rational persuasion, but constitute, at least in the eyes of Neoptolemos, a wilful, 'savage' rejection of the human solidarity that Philoktetes had earlier said he lacked and that Neoptolemos had offered him. His rejection of Neoptolemos is all the more pointed and powerful, because Philoktetes resembles Neoptolemos' own father, Achilles, whose anger (μῆνις) and hatred of Agamemnon in the *Iliad* lead him to withdraw from the fighting, although this is the element in which he is most fully and productively himself, and to reject the persuasion of friends who urge him to return both for his own sake and for the sake of the army. Philoktetes is true to an old-fashioned, Achillean model of heroism, grounded absolutely and without compromise in his sense of his own honour and shame. The other exemplars of this heroic way of life have perished in the war (331–6, 410–50), and the survivors, including Odysseus, live by other standards – of

relativism and opportunism, compromise and change – which are foreign to Philoktetes.

For Philoktetes to cling to his epic heroism would constitute a triumph over Odysseus and the sons of Atreus, but it would also be self-defeating, because it would mean not being healed and not having the opportunity to participate in the war and be 'judged the one | best man among the Greeks' (1344–5), just as in the *Iliad* Achilles is 'the best of the Achaians' (1.412). Furthermore, though remaining on Lemnos would preserve Philoktetes' honour, it would be an act of individual self-assertion without social utility, a choice to remain unproductively 'wretched, alone, | desolate' (227–8), 'without a community, a corpse among the living' (1018) – in Achillean terms, 'a burden on the fertile earth' (ἐπὶ ὥσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης, *Il.* 18.104). Philoktetes is prepared to make such a choice, but he does not have to do so. First, he persuades Neoptolemos to take him home (1398–1401), then he is saved by the intervention of Herakles, who addresses him on behalf of Zeus in terms that make it possible for him to accept what he felt compelled to reject when it was offered by Neoptolemos. Herakles enables Philoktetes to *choose*, rather than be forced, to go to Troy, where he can be healed and make his heroism both personally and socially productive.

Philoktetes' choice is made even more meaningful by a structural and verbal echo of the scene in the first book of the *Iliad*, where Athena appears suddenly to stop Achilles from killing Agamemnon. In that scene, the goddess says that she has come from heaven with a message from Hera, asks Achilles to stop his rage (1.207 μένος), and tells him that he will be rewarded three times over in the future, if he obeys the two of them (*Il.* 1. 207–14); Achilles immediately consents: 'nor did he disobey the word of Athena' (οὐδ' ἀπείθεσε | μύθῳ Ἀθηναίης, 1.220–1). Similarly, Herakles says (in strikingly epic diction, cf. 1409–10n., 1411–12n., 1416n.) that he has come from heaven to inform Philoktetes of Zeus's plans for him and to 'hold you back from the journey on which you are setting forth'; he tells Philoktetes to hear (i.e. heed) his words, and Philoktetes, when he has done so, immediately consents: 'I will not disobey your words' (οὐδ' ἀπείθεσω τοῖς σοῖς μύθοις, 1447). This verbal echo of *Il.* 1.220–1 associates Philoktetes' obedience to Herakles (and Zeus) with Achilles' obedience to Athena (and Hera). One effect of this association with Achilles is to magnify Philoktetes' heroism, just at the point where his giving in to persuasion might seem to diminish it. Another effect, however, is to demonstrate how different Philoktetes' decision to obey Herakles is from Achilles' decision to obey Athena: Achilles' decision is followed by a verbal attack on Agamemnon, which is part of the process by which he separates himself from the army, but Philoktetes' decision signifies the abandonment of his rage against Odysseus and the sons of Atreus and is part of the process by which he agrees to rejoin the fighting and be re-socialized.

When Philoktetes chooses to go to Troy and help sack the city, it is striking how, in his farewell to the island, his description of the landscape changes. The harsh natural features of the island, in and against which Philoktetes has had to

struggle for survival, are now seen as products of human culture or as gentle and beneficent. For example, the rock-cave, which Philoktetes had apostrophized as 'you hollow of cavernous rock, hot and cold (by turns)' (1081–2), is now 'the house that kept watch with me';⁸⁰ Philoktetes similarly recalls how 'Mt Hermaion often sent | me, in the storms of my sorrow, | a lament in response to my own voice', 1458–60), though earlier, at least according to the Chorus, he heard only the 'babbling echo' of his bitter complaints (188–90) and had 'no one in the land as a neighbour to his troubles, | beside whom he could bewail the disease | with groans that called forth a response . . . ' (692–4). Formerly, Philoktetes emphasized the difficulty of obtaining water to drink (292–5), but now he mentions the 'springs and Lykian fount' (1461). Now that he is leaving, Philoktetes speaks of the island as populated by 'Nymphs living in the waters and meadows', whose femininity complements the 'male pounding of the sea against the promontory' (1454–5). Here an image of violent nature is replaced by one of fruitful cooperation between male and female forces that benignly companion rather than assault Philoktetes.⁸¹ These final invocations of the landscape reflect a perspective entirely changed by the words of Herakles to which he has assented.

6.5 *Herakles*

Herakles' intervention *ex machina* brings about Philoktetes' salvation, altering the play's apparent dénouement and bringing its ending into conformity with the standard myth, according to which, as Sophokles' audience would have known, Philoktetes *did* go to Troy, where he killed Paris and participated in the sack of the city.⁸² The ending of the play has had a mixed response from interpreters. Some have found it psychologically implausible that Philoktetes should give in so readily, considering his characterization throughout the play. They dismiss the scene with Herakles as an arbitrary, purely theatrical conclusion that is not to be taken seriously.⁸³ Others have argued that Herakles' intervention is appropriate, because of his special relationship to Philoktetes and the importance elsewhere in the play of his bow, his previous sack of Troy (1439–40), and his apotheosis (726–9, 801–3).⁸⁴ They see Herakles' speech at 1418–44 as an expression of Philoktetes' own desire and a divinity that comes from within himself,⁸⁵ or as a manifestation of a just and beneficent divine order.⁸⁶ Still others consider the apparent incommensurability of the 'happy ending' with the rest of the play as a generic marker

⁸⁰ On the word for house, μέλαθρον, cf. 1453n.

⁸¹ Earlier the main female presence, apart from the island itself, was the disease, which attacked, penetrated, or devoured his body (cf. 758–9, 807–8).

⁸² Herakles is the only *deus ex machina* in the surviving plays of Sophokles, though there may have been similar divine epiphanies at the end of *Athamas* (with Herakles as the god) and of *Peleus* (with Thetis), and gods appear on stage in *Ajax* and the fragmentary *Niobe*.

⁸³ E.g. Linforth 1956: 148–56.

⁸⁴ On Herakles and his weapons earlier in the play, see Reinhardt 1979: 190.

⁸⁵ E.g. Whitman 1951: 187. ⁸⁶ E.g. Kitto 1956: 154–7.

of a new kind of drama, a tragicomedy or romance like Euripides' nearly contemporaneous dramas of intrigue and salvation, *Ion*, *Helen*, and *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, or like Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. In this new genre, which, as it were, goes beyond tragedy, Herakles, a mortal elevated by heroic suffering into a divinity associated with healing and salvation, offers Philoktetes rebirth from suffering and isolation on Lemnos and a socially productive heroism in the service of destiny.⁸⁷

It is likely that an Athenian audience would have been predisposed to see Herakles' appearance *ex machina* as ethically and dramatically appropriate, because of his worship in Attic cults as a hero who 'wards off harm' (Ἀλεξίκακος) and his legendary acceptance into the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁸⁸ There is no evidence of a cult of Herakles the Saviour (Ἡρακλῆς Σωτήρ) in classical Athens, as there is at Thasos and Miletos,⁸⁹ but it is possible that Athenian relations with these places would have made such a cult-identity familiar to Sophokles' original audience. If so, the intervention of Herakles to save both Philoktetes and the traditional story of the end of the Trojan War might have seemed to them all the more fitting, even though Philoktetes would leave behind the necessity (and therefore the opportunity) for the kind of heroic greatness he demonstrates in the course of the play.

Sophokles' audience would certainly have known from the traditional myth and earlier dramatizations of Philoktetes' story that the play was supposed to end with him going to Troy and helping to win the war. When the play seemed to be ending at 1408 with Neoptolemos taking Philoktetes home, they would have been both puzzled and expectant. Therefore, when a second ending succeeded the first, they would have welcomed it as satisfying both the traditional story and their own expectations.⁹⁰ The second ending follows appropriately on Philoktetes' expression of solidarity and offer to protect Neoptolemos against the Greek army (1405–8), which anticipates his movement away from an isolated, asocial existence on Lemnos toward reintegration into human society. His promise of support seems to call forth Herakles' sudden appearance at 1409, speaking words that Philoktetes can now 'hear' and from which he can now benefit.⁹¹ The renewed friendship between Philoktetes and Neoptolemos, in particular, looks forward to Herakles' use of the dual at 1436–7, where he links their friendship with the sack of Troy.⁹²

Herakles builds on Philoktetes' gesture of solidarity with Neoptolemos, but provides Philoktetes with an even better way out of his self-defeating savagery and

⁸⁷ See Greengard 1987: 88–106.

⁸⁸ See Greengard 1987: 88–106, following Woodford 1966: 9–35. Cf. the celebration in Attic cult promised to Herakles by Theseus at Eur. *Her.* 1326–37, in return for saving him. On cults of Herakles generally, see Farnell 1921: 95–153, Burkert 1985: 210–11.

⁸⁹ See Farnell 1921: 153.

⁹⁰ On the two endings, *Ph.* 1402–8 and 1409–71, see Hoppin 1990.

⁹¹ Cf. Matthiessen 1981: 24–5, Newman 1991: 307–8, 310, Carlevale 2000: 54–6, Hose 2008.

⁹² Cf. Steidle 1968: 187, Easterling 1978: 35.

unproductive isolation. Herakles can reach Philoktetes in a way that Neoptolemos cannot, because he appeals to him in the name of their old friendship and of the authority of Zeus. 'I have come for your sake' (τὴν σὴν δ' ἤκω χάριν), he tells him, using a word, χάρις ('sake'), that can mean both a spontaneously offered favour and the thanks one gives in return for a favour received, as well as a disposition or attitude that evokes a favour or gratitude from someone else. In 1413 χάριν suggests the favour that Philoktetes did Herakles by lighting his funeral pyre, relieving his suffering, and helping him to become a god – the favour for which Philoktetes had long ago received Herakles' unconquerable weapons (cf. 670, 801–2). Herakles' appeal to Philoktetes to 'hear [his] words' (1417) and Philoktetes' agreement to do so are felt as reciprocal expressions of χάρις that continue their earlier relationship.

Herakles strengthens this relationship by offering himself as a model for Philoktetes of 'undying glory' won through toil (1418–22). A few lines earlier Philoktetes had told Neoptolemos, 'Let me suffer what I must suffer' (1397), meaning, in Neoptolemos' words, 'to go on living as you have been living, without salvation' (1396). Now Herakles in effect expands and transforms the meaning of 'what I must suffer' (cf. 1421 with 1421–2n.) and brings about the 'salvation' that seemed impossible. This salvation turns out to include not merely getting off the island and returning home – an improvement over his current situation, yet one that would leave Philoktetes just as socially unproductive as he is on Lemnos – but a journey to Troy, where he will be cured of his painful disease and judged first in the army for bravery, killing Paris, sacking the city, and bringing home 'the greatest prize for valour' (1423–9). Philoktetes will then have the opportunity to express reciprocally his friendship with Herakles, both because 'it is destined that the city be taken a second time | by [Herakles'] bow' (1439–40), and because Philoktetes will dedicate some of the spoils at the site of Herakles' pyre as a memorial to the bow (1431–3).

It has been suggested that Herakles' words at 1422, 'to make your life glorious after and through these labours', following mention of his own 'undying glory' (1420), allude to a hero-cult in which Philoktetes was worshipped on Chryse.⁹³ Hero-cults constituted a kind of posthumous immortality for mortals whose actions and achievements during their lifetimes were so extraordinary that they seemed to transcend the normal limits of what human beings are capable of doing or suffering. A 'hero' may have seemed repellent, even monstrous, when alive, but after death his or her power was harnessed at the site of the grave, where the 'hero' could exert beneficent power on behalf of the local community of worshippers. Such cults are actually established or at least intimated as part

⁹³ Harrison 1989: 173–5. Appian (second century CE) mentions that the Roman general Lucullus in 73 BCE overtook enemy forces 'at a deserted island in the region of Lemnos, where there is displayed an altar to Philoktetes and, all in bronze, a serpent, and a bow and a corselet bound with ribbons as a memorial to his suffering' (Appian, *Mithridates* 77, tr. Harrison).

of the dramatic action in *Ajax* and *Oidipous at Kolonos*, but unlike the heroes of those plays, Philoktetes does not die. Rather, Herakles refers to the glory that Philoktetes is to 'suffer' (παθεῖν, 1421) while alive, not after death, and the life he will make glorious by his heroic achievements. One might argue that because Philoktetes is symbolically dead when he is on Lemnos (cf. 946, 1018, 1030), the 'life of glory' that Herakles speaks of should be thought of as posthumous. Hero-cult, however, can result only from an actual death followed by appropriate offerings at the grave. *Philoktetes* has thematic affinities with the earlier *Ajax* and later *Oidipous at Kolonos*, but it differs from these plays in large part because the hero does *not* die but is restored in his lifetime to socially meaningful health and productivity.⁹⁴

7 LANGUAGE AND STYLE

Philoktetes is written in the archaizing, 'poetic' language characteristic of Sophoklean tragedy and Attic tragedy generally, a language elevated above ordinary, spoken Attic by its frequent use of forms and diction taken from earlier Greek poetry, though this language also includes colloquial Attic expressions, draws on contemporary literary Ionic, and has a limited Doric vocabulary.⁹⁵ If the manuscripts can be trusted (which is by no means certain), the language of dialogue is for the most part Attic with an admixture of Ionic, the main dialect used in earlier spoken verse including archaic epic and the iambic, trochaic, and elegiac poetry of the Ionian iambographers. For example, the use of η and long α in tragedy is Attic, but Ionic – σσ – and – ρσ – are normal rather than Attic – ττ – and – ρρ – (e.g. 87 πράσσειν, not πράττειν, 667 θάρσει, not θάρρει). Occasionally, a word that is exclusively poetic and not part of ordinary Attic is found in its Doric form (e.g. 143 λαός, 217, 1181 ναός, 669 ἕκατι, 677, 1164 πελάταν). Some of these words and forms were familiar from Homeric epic (e.g. λαός, ναός), others were adopted from choral poetry in which Doric was the standard dialect.

The language of tragic choral poetry (and of lines sung by individual characters in lyric exchanges with choruses, e.g. Philoktetes in his exchange with the Chorus in 1081–1217) has superficial Doric features. These include long α for η in forms of the definite article and the demonstrative ἥδε, in the endings of many nouns and adjectives (e.g. 214 ἀγροβάτας, 395 ἐπηυδῶμαν), and in a small group of other words (e.g. 395 μάτηρ, 683 θνατῶν, 711 πτανοῖς, 849 μάλιστα, 1101 τλάμων, 1102 λωβατός). Doric genitive singulars in long α and genitive plurals in – ᾶν are also found, as well as the third-person pronoun νιν for Ionic μιν. Long α, however, is typically avoided in compounds (e.g. 186 ἀνήκεστ', 676 ἐξήκουσ',

⁹⁴ If there was a cult of Philoketes on Chryse, it would not have been at the site of his grave in Italy, where there certainly was hero-cult (below, p. 43), but at the site where he was bitten by the serpent.

⁹⁵ Cf. Horrocks 1997: 20–1, Meillet 1975: 217–22, Palmer 1980: 130–41, Mastronarde 2002: 81–96, Rutherford 2010: 442–54.

1135 πολυμηχάνου) and in certain words familiar from epic (e.g. 140 σκήπτρον, 189 τηλεφάνης, 709 ἀλφηστὰι, 1085 θηνήσκοντι). Occasionally there are hybrid forms with both long α and η (e.g. 697 κηκιομέναν, 1144 ἔφημοσύνα).

Ionicisms in *Philoktetes*, as in Sophoklean tragedy generally, were either inherited from the epic tradition or taken over into Attic from contemporary Ionic. Inherited ionicisms include the absence of contraction (e.g. 663 φᾶος, 217, 1181 νᾶός), compensatory lengthening before ν (e.g. 183 μοῦνος, 1038 οὔνεκα), datives in -οισι and -αῖσι (cf. 471, 1266, 1470), and certain words or grammatical forms felt to be 'poetic' and used in place of common Attic equivalents (e.g. 59 ἔχθος, 60 μολεῖν, 676 ὄπωπα, 711 ἀνύσειε (cf. 720, 1145), 1226 πιθόμενος, σύμπαντι, 1346 ἔλθειν). They also include traditional epic formulas (e.g. 709 ἀνέρες ἀλφηστὰι) or adapted formulas (e.g. 721 ποντοπόρῳ δούρατι, cf. 721-6n.). Inherited ionicisms are most common in messenger speeches or other long narratives, such as the speeches of Neoptolemos at 343-90 and of the False Merchant at 603-21.

Non-epic, contemporary ionicisms include 751 νεοχμόν (= νέος), 179, 1348 αἰών (meaning 'life' rather than 'eternity' as in Attic), 956 τοισίδ', and many of the abstract nouns that are so conspicuous in Sophoklean poetry, some of which he may have coined.⁹⁶ These include nouns ending in -μα, which usually denote the result of verbal action; those ending in -σις, which usually denote an ongoing action or process and are especially common in *Philoktetes* and *Oidipous at Kolonos*; those ending in -εια or -ια, which sometimes refer to action but usually denote qualities, concepts, or the temperament of individuals who can be referred to by the adjective corresponding to the noun (e.g. εὐσέβεια-εὐσεβής, σοφία-σοφός).⁹⁷ Many of these abstract nouns are also found or have close parallels in fifth-century Ionic prose, especially medical and philosophical writings.

Some linguistic features of *Philoktetes* are typical of tragedy generally, for example, the use of simple verbs where ordinary Attic has compounds.⁹⁸ Other features are characteristically Sophoklean, including the frequent use of abstract nouns and of verbs with the prepositional prefix ἐκ- or ἐξ-, suggesting that the action of the verb is 'well', 'fully', or 'thoroughly' performed (e.g. 55 ἐκκλέψεις, 79, 407 ἔξοιδα, 95 ἔξαμαρτεῖν, 288 ἐξηύρισκε, 329 ἔξερῶ, 330 ἐξελωβήθη, 423 ἐξήρκε, 668 κάζεπεύξασθαι).

The detailed study of these and other individual features of Sophoklean diction is instructive, but does not account for the 'magisterial elusiveness' of Sophokles' superficially simple language, rhetoric, and style, which turn out to be remarkably complex when one tries to understand in detail how they actually work on an audience or reader.⁹⁹ Clauses, sentences, and verse paragraphs unfold

⁹⁶ Cf. Long 1968: 13-14n. ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*: 13-26, Schmid 1934: 486-7.

⁹⁸ Cf. 48n. This use of simple for compound is so 'tragic' that it is parodied by Aristophanes in 'paratragic' passages, e.g. θνήσκω for ἀποθνήσκω at *Ach.* 893-4 and *Thesm.* 865.

⁹⁹ Silk 2009: 134. For analysis of Sophoklean language, syntax and style, see especially Campbell, *Essay* 1879: 1-107, still worth consulting; Jebb's commentaries augmented by the General Index in Pearson 1917, vol. III: 192-349, Moorhouse on syntax, Long 1968

with constant variation in syntax, word-order, rhetoric, and metre,¹⁰⁰ and long sentences, especially, often move in unexpected directions that defy expectations of what they are (or should be) saying. The literal sense of what one character says to another is usually clear, but sometimes there is ambiguity, especially in 'triangular' scenes such as *Ph.* 542–627 (the scene with the False Merchant), where a remark by one character can mean different things to the two other characters who are present and to the Chorus, not to mention spectators in the theatre and the play's readers.¹⁰¹

Sophoklean spoken verse is exceptionally supple and flexible, especially compared with that of Aischylos or Euripides. Although the poetry is clearly stichic, in the sense that every line (*stichos*) is a distinct metrical period consisting of two cola,¹⁰² there is frequently tension between a metrical boundary, such as the end of the line or the caesura, and a rhetorical or semantic unit, consisting of a phrase or sentence, which begins and/or ends in the middle of a line or a colon. Nearly one-third of the lines in *Philoketes* have enjambment, with a wide variety of syntactic arrangements. These include so-called 'Sophoklean enjambment', in which a conjunction or relative pronoun at or near the end of one line introduces a phrase or clause in the next (e.g. 405–6, 443–4), thus destroying the stichic integrity of each line. A similar effect is achieved when an adjective or adverb in one line modifies or describes a word in the following line (e.g. 94–5, 1004–5), or a noun or verb in one line is modified or described by an adjective or adverb in the next (e.g. 473–4, 1078–9); a noun or pronoun in one line is the subject or object of a verb in the next (e.g. 308–9, 462–3); or a verb in one line has its subject or object, or is followed by a complementary infinitive, indirect discourse, or an object clause, in the next (e.g. 126–7, 869–70, 1400–1). Similarly, a definite article (and adjective) at the end of one line is sometimes followed by its substantive in the following line (e.g. 13–14, 431–2); *δεῖ* at the end of one line introduces a complementary infinitive or indirect discourse construction in the next (e.g. 11–12, 982–3), or a subject accusative anticipates its infinitive (e.g. 870–1, 1395–6); *μή* or *οὐ* looks forward across line end to the word it negates in the following line (e.g. 611–12, 912–13); or *ὅν* in one line precedes the verb with which it is felt in the

on vocabulary, Budelmann 2000 on language as communication shaping the responses of audiences and readers, De Jong and Rijksbaron 2006 for a variety of fresh perspectives and rich bibliographies, Goldhill 2012 on how the language engages audiences through its formal qualities and 'flickering instabilities of expression' (Goldhill 2012: 6), and Rutherford 2012 (esp. 70–118) on the interpretive significance of specific features and patterns of diction, syntax, and style. For specific topics, see Easterling 1973 and Avezzù 1974 on repetition, Segal 1977 on synaesthesia, Silk 1996 and 2009 and Easterling 1999 on techniques of linguistic simplicity and complexity, and Nooter 2012 on the lyrical voice and distinctive rhetoric that give heroes poetic authority.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Easterling 1999: 95.

¹⁰¹ See Easterling 1997a: 169–70; Budelmann 2000: 19–60, esp. 16–17, 29–30, 40–50. Cf. 542–627n., 589–90n.

¹⁰² See below, p. 37.

next (e.g. e.g. 46–7, 1072–3). Occasionally, a post-positive particle or sequence of particles comes at the end of one line, and the sentence continues in the next (e.g. 674–5, 766–7), and once a preposition looks forward across line end to its object in the following line (626–7). When the syntax bridges line end in these ways, it can sometimes create the impression that the main unit of poetic composition is not the line but the sentence, or even, as in late Shakespearean poetry, the verse-paragraph.

Another distinctive feature of Sophoklean poetry is the frequency with which particles articulate meaning and introduce nuance. Particles are more frequent and their use more varied in Sophokles than in Aischylos or Euripides.¹⁰³ Sometimes they create a straightforward parallelism between phrases or clauses (μέν . . . δέ . . . , οὐκ . . . ἀλλά . . .), but often there is a slight deviation or variation that makes the construction not exactly parallel, e.g. 279–80 ὁρῶντα μὲν ναῦς . . . , | πᾶσας βεβῶσας, ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' ἔντοπον, where μὲν follows the participle and δέ its object, or 1424–5 πρῶτον μὲν . . . ἀρετῇ τε πρῶτος, where there is a similar lack of parallelism and μὲν is correlative to τε rather than δέ. Sometimes particles make a logical connection, introduce an explanation (γάρ), or produce emphasis (γε, δῆ, μὲν, τοι etc.). In a language without a stress accent (or with one that is subjected in poetry to the quantitative metrical organization),¹⁰⁴ particles are an important means of calling attention to particular words and ideas, which Sophokles does more frequently and with greater nuance than any other Greek poet.

Furthermore, because word-end and specific metrical word-shapes are more common at certain positions in the line than at others,¹⁰⁵ words, phrases, clauses, and sentences can gain emphasis by ending at positions where they do not normally end, or because their metrical word-shapes are atypical and therefore marked. For example, in 101 λέγω σ' ἐγὼ δόλωι Φιλοκτῆτην λαβεῖν, δόλωι is emphatic because words of the shape υ— (like all words of more than one syllable) are extremely rare at position 6, when their final syllable is not elided and there is no word-end at position 7, i.e. when the line has no regular caesura at position 5 or position 7 (cf. 737, 1064, 1369). This metrical anomaly, known as 'middle caesura',¹⁰⁶ calls attention to δόλωι ('treacherous guile'), thus strengthening the characterization of Odysseus as a hero with values antithetical to those of Neoptolemos and expressing the urgency he feels that Neoptolemos should do as he says. Individual words can also gain emphasis by being placed at the beginning or end of the sentence and/or the line, especially when they are separated from

¹⁰³ There are more words per line in the average Sophoklean trimeter (5.9) than in the average Aischylean trimeter (5.4), mainly because there are more monosyllables, and most of these monosyllables are particles. In *Ph.* there are, on average, 6.1 words per line, two of which are monosyllables. Cf. Schein 1979: 42.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Allen 1973: 274–334, 1984: 131–40.

¹⁰⁵ Schein 1979: 18–23, 36–42, 65 with Tables II and III.

¹⁰⁶ See below, pp. 37–8 with n. 116.

words with which they agree, e.g. 113 μόνα, which assures Neoptolemos that 'Troy will be taken by this bow *alone*', i.e. *only* by this bow.¹⁰⁷

Even when a word is not placed at the beginning or end of the line or the sentence, its separation from another word or words with which it is in a grammatical or syntactic relationship can make the separated word more emphatic (hyperbaton). Any variation of normal word order can have the same effect, e.g. the common rhetorical figure known as *prolepsis* (or anticipation), in which the subject of a dependent clause is anticipated and made the object of the verb of the main clause, which precedes the dependent clause. This construction is especially common with a demonstrative or personal pronoun in an indirect question, e.g. 444 τοῦτον οἷσθ' εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ, 534–5 ὥς με καὶ μάθῃς | ἄφ' ὧν διέζων ὥς τ' ἔφυν εὐκάρδιος. Such variation of word-order is not, of course, peculiarly Sophoklean, but the frequency with which it occurs contributes to the distinctive texture and flavour of his verse and helps to guide an attentive listener or reader.

Sophoklean poetry is plainer in its relatively unadorned diction than that of Aischylos or Euripides, with far fewer compound adjectives and far less stylistic ornament. *Philoktetes* has only one extended simile at 1436–7, and there are only about a half-dozen in the seven surviving plays. On the other hand, Sophoklean poetry is constantly and insistently dramatic, in that every word and phrase contributes to the development not only of an individual line or speech, but of the action, characterization, themes, and ideas of a particular play.¹⁰⁸ One important way the poetry achieves this effect is through continual linguistic, grammatical, syntactic, or rhetorical oppositions and contrasts. Sometimes these involve no more than the juxtaposition of words or phrases with contrasting meanings and/or grammatical functions, e.g. 101 σ' ἐγώ, 603 ἐγώ σ', 673 εὖ δρᾶν εὖ παθῶν. Sometimes these words come in successive lines (e.g. 477–8 δνειδος οὐ καλόν | . . . εὐκλείας γέρας, 1268–9 ἐκ λόγων | καλῶν κακῶς ἔπραξα, 1311–12 οὐχὶ Σισύφου πατρός, | ἀλλ' ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως. A thought may be expressed both positively and negatively, e.g. 527 χῆ ναῦς γὰρ ἄξει κούκ ἀπαρνηθήσεται, or words or phrases of contrasting meaning are found in a parallel construction, e.g. 17–18 ἐν ψυχῇ μὲν . . . , ἐν θέρῃ δ', 97 γλώσσαν μὲν ἄργόν, χεῖρα δ' εἶχον ἐργάτιν, 476 τό τ' αἰσχρὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν εὐκλεές, 1021 σὺ μὲν γέγηθας ζῶν, ἐγὼ δ' ἀλγύνομαι. In other instances, one word or phrase is juxtaposed with another on which it is dependent (e.g. 1284 ἀρίστου πατρὸς αἰσχιστος γεγώς). Sometimes the contrast between two phrases is strengthened by the repetition of a word, e.g. 1244 σοφὸς πεφυκῶς οὐδὲν ἐξαυδαῖς σοφόν.

¹⁰⁷ Dik 2007 argues, mainly on the basis of pragmatics, that the beginning and end of the line and the sentence are not marked and therefore not emphatic, but in preparing this commentary I have found that they often are. Perhaps it is best to think of these positions as potentially emphatic, though the potentiality is only sometimes fulfilled.

¹⁰⁸ Kirkwood 1958: 215.

8.1 Iambic trimeter

As its name suggests, an individual iambic trimeter (or line) can be described as three successive, four-syllable iambic metra ('measures'). The first syllable in an iambic metron can be either heavy or light, the second syllable is heavy, the third syllable light, and the fourth syllable heavy; therefore, a descriptive schema for the iambic trimeter is $x - \cup - x - \cup - x - \cup -$.¹¹³ Such a description, however, has limited utility: metron boundaries coincide with word-end relatively rarely, except at the end of the line, so metra often lack 'semantic integrity'. They do not describe the organization of heavy and light syllables in units of linguistic expression – words, phrases, and clauses – or specify the positions in the line at which these semantic elements are found.

It seems more fruitful to describe the iambic trimeter as consisting of two cola, defined by unusually frequent word-end after the fifth and/or the seventh element of the line (the caesura) and by invariable word-end at the end of the line.¹¹⁴ In this commentary the elements of the trimeter are numbered from 1 to 12, with the caesura(s) marked by a vertical broken line:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
 $x - \cup - x : - \cup - x - \cup - .$

Specific trimeters are described in terms of positions of word-end and the shape of individual words within the two cola and the line. Thus the first line of *Philoktetes*, ἀκτὴ μὲν ἦδε τῆς περιρρύτου χθονός, has word-end at positions 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 12 and a caesura at position 5:

2 3 5 6 10
 $- - | \cup | \cup : - | \cup - - - | \cup - .$ ¹¹⁵

Almost all of the nearly 12,000 iambic trimeters in the tragedies of Aischylos and Sophokles have a caesura at position 5 or position 7 or at both positions. A small percentage do not have a caesura in either place and instead have word-end with elision at position 6, bisecting the line. Fourteen anomalous lines in the seven surviving tragedies of Aischylos and fifteen in those of Sophokles have word-end at position 6 without elision ('middle caesura'), including four lines in *Philoktetes*

¹¹³ For the meaning of metrical abbreviations, terms and symbols used in this introduction and commentary, see the Key (below, pp. 41–3). This commentary assumes knowledge of how to determine whether a particular syllable is heavy or light. See, e.g., Allen 1973: 89–95, 104–6.

¹¹⁴ A caesura is simply a place in the line where word-end occurs more often than would be expected, other things being equal.

¹¹⁵ For purposes of metrical analysis and descriptive clarity, it is convenient to count each unit of accentuation, as printed in our texts, as an individual word. That a word is post-positive or part of a word-group is a rhetorical, not a metrical, phenomenon. Cf. Schein 1979: xi.

(101, 737, 1064, 1369).¹¹⁶ There are no instances of middle caesura in the c. 18,000 iambic trimeters in the eighteen surviving plays of Euripides.

The iambic trimeter as described above consists of twelve syllables, but sometimes there are more, because the heavy elements at positions 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 can be 'resolved' into two light syllables, and there can be substitution of two light syllables for the *anceps* syllables at positions 1, 5, and 9.¹¹⁷ 'Resolution' is most common at positions 1, 2, and 6, where the cola begin; it is rare at position 4 and extremely rare at position 10, presumably so that it does not interfere with the final cadence of the first colon and of the line.¹¹⁸ In tragedy, though 'substitution' is common at position 1, it is rare at positions 5 and 9. Only nine *anceps* syllables in the seven surviving plays of Sophokles undergo substitution by two light syllables at these positions, all in proper names which would otherwise be difficult to fit into the metre (cf. 793–5n.).

Twelve per cent of the iambic trimeters in *Philoktetes* have at least one resolution, which is far more than in any other surviving play of Sophokles.¹¹⁹ These resolutions are not distributed evenly throughout the play, but tend to occur in scenes of heightened emotion, where they reflect the speakers' urgency or excitement. Sometimes resolution results from the need to fit a proper name into the iambic trimeter, e.g. 4 Νεοπτόλεμε. Yet even those resolutions that occur in proper names sometimes serve a dramatic purpose, as in 794 Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε, where the resolutions at position 1 and position 5 reflect Philoktetes' strong emotion (cf. 793–5n.).

Philoktetes also has more occurrences of *antilabē* (the division of a line between two or more speakers) than any other extant Sophoklean play except *OC*, and significantly more than are found in any of the five earlier plays.¹²⁰ Cases of *antilabē* express a special urgency, excitement, or intensity of feeling and are, for the most part, grouped in a few scenes of 'dramatic excitement' and heightened emotion (see 54n.).

There is a strong constraint in the iambic trimeter of tragedy against a polysyllabic word-ending in a heavy syllable at position 9, unless it is followed by a post-positive and thus is part of a word-group ending at position 10. This constraint, known as Porson's Law, reflects two other metrical phenomena: (1) the rarity of *all* word-end, not only polysyllabic words with heavy final syllables, at position 9, and (2) the tendency for the *anceps* syllable at position 9 to be light rather than heavy, though the reverse is true at positions 1 and 5.¹²¹ Like resolution at position 10, a word-ending at position 9, especially at the end of a polysyllable,

¹¹⁶ Cf. Schein 1979: 20–1, 38–9.

¹¹⁷ By convention, such 'substitution' is also known as 'resolution', even though it is not strictly true that the *anceps* syllable is heavy.

¹¹⁸ Schein 1979: 78, Table xxxi. ¹¹⁹ Schein 1979: 77, Table xxix.

¹²⁰ Kitto 1939: 178 gives the following numbers: *Aj.* 8, *Ant.* 0, *Tr.* 2, *OT* 10, *El.* 15, *Ph.* 30, *OC* 44.

¹²¹ Cf. Schein 1979: 65, Tables II and II; 73, Tables xx and xxi.

would interfere (to some degree) with the normative final cadence of the line.

In the iambic trimeter of comedy, which is the main metre of dialogue as in tragedy, resolution is far more common, and two light syllables can take the place of an *anceps* or a light syllable; Porson's Law is not strictly observed, and about one line in five has polysyllabic word-end in a heavy syllable at position 9. When comic poets wish to make a character sound 'tragic', they often make this character's trimeters observe Porson's Law and conform to the norms of resolution in the tragic trimeter.

8.2 Trochaic tetrameter catalectic

Trochaic tetrameter catalectic metre, which is found in 1402–8 of *Philoktetes*, was also, like the iambic trimeter, inherited by the tragic poets from the poetry of the Ionian iambographers. The sequence of heavy and light syllables in a trochaic metron is $\sim\text{—}$, and a trochaic tetrameter catalectic consists of four trochaic cola, the last of which 'leaves off' (*katalēgei*) and omits the final syllable:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
 $\sim\text{—} \sim\text{—} \sim\text{—} \sim\text{—} \text{—} | \sim\text{—} \sim\text{—} \sim\text{—} \sim\text{—}$

There is always word-end after the eighth element of the line, except in Aesch. *Pers.* 165, where a plausible conjecture would eliminate the anomaly, and *Ph.* 1402, where the anomaly is poetically motivated (cf. 1402n). Polysyllabic word-end in a heavy final syllable is avoided at positions 4 and 12 (as at position 9 of the iambic trimeter). There can be resolution of the first six heavy elements of the line, but not of the *anceps* syllables. All seven trochaic tetrameters in *Ph.* have *antilabē*, except 1408, and there are two changes of speaker in 1407.

8.3 Anapaestic dimeter

The pattern of heavy and light syllables in an anapaestic metron is $\sim\sim\text{—}$, and in tragedy there usually are two metra per line (anapaestic dimeter), with free substitution of one heavy syllable for two light syllables or two light syllables for one heavy syllable:

$\sim\sim \sim\sim | \sim\sim \sim\sim$

Occasionally a line consisting of just one anapaestic metron (anapaestic monometer) is interspersed among the iambic dimeters, e.g. *Ph.* 1414, 1446, 1450. Typically a sequence of anapaestic dimeter lines, known as a 'system', is punctuated by a 'paroemiac', $\sim\sim - \sim\sim - \sim\sim - \sim\sim$, which might be thought of as a 'syncopated' anapaestic dimeter, i.e. an anapaestic dimeter with the next to the last element omitted. Normally anapaests have Attic η rather than long α . This

norm, however, is violated in 1445–6 and 1470–1, the first two lines and final two lines of the play's final anapaestic sequence.

Most anapaests in tragedy, though categorized as spoken verse, were probably chanted and are sometimes compared to recitative in opera. These so-called 'marching anapaests', which can be voiced by either the chorus or a character, are particularly common in tragedy when the chorus or one or more characters are marching or walking, especially in exits and entrances, e.g. *Ph.* 1409–17, when Herakles moves forward on the roof of the *skēnē*, and 1452–71, when Philoktetes, Neoptolemos, and the Chorus make their final exit. Anapaestic dimeter is often found at the beginning of a chorus' entry song (*parodos*), but in the *parodos* of *Ph.* the entry song consists of an exchange between the Chorus, singing three strophes and antistrophes (135–43/150–8, 169–90, 201–18), and Neoptolemos chanting three sequences of anapaests (144–9, 159–68, 191–200). (Neoptolemos sings a few syllables in the first lines of strophe and antistrophe γ, and the Chorus Leader chants one anapaestic line at 161.) Some anapaests, with a higher emotional register and distinctive metrical and linguistic features, may have been sung,¹²² but there are no such 'lyric' (or 'melic' or 'threnodic') anapaests in *Philoktetes*.

8.4 Sung (lyric) metre

The sung poetry of Greek tragedy is for the most part organized in choral odes (*stasima*) consisting of one or more pairs of stanzas, known as strophes and antistrophes, in which there is an identical or almost identical sequence of heavy and light syllables in each pair ('responsion', 'corresponsion'). Sometimes a strophe and antistrophe are followed by a stanza in a related metre, known as an epode, and the combination of strophe, antistrophe, and epode is known as a 'triad' (e.g. 826–64). Each individual stanza is organized in metrical 'periods' or 'lines', with a 'continuity' or flow (*sunapheia*) of syllables within the period that is independent of the meaning of the words, the punctuation, or even change(s) of speaker. There is a 'pause' at the end of each metrical period (indicated by the symbol ||), and the final syllable in a period is always counted as heavy. The end of a period has at least one of the following three markers: (1) hiatus, when a vowel or diphthong at the end of the final word in one period is followed by a vowel or diphthong at the beginning of the first word in the next period; (2) *brevis in longo* (or *syllaba brevis in elemento longo*, lit. 'a short syllable in a long position'), when the final syllable in the period is light, yet counts as heavy, if the corresponding syllable in the other stanza is heavy; (3) a *clausula* ('close'), i.e. a sequence of syllables at the end of a metrical period, familiar from its occurrence elsewhere in Greek lyric poetry, in which an expected light syllable is omitted before the final syllable. Metrical pause often, though by no means always, coincides with semantic pause, but words that go together grammatically or syntactically can

¹²² See Mastronarde 2002: 114–15, Dale 1968: 47–52.

occur at the end of one period and the beginning of the next or even at the end of one stanza and the beginning of the next (this does not occur in *Philoktetes*).

The main kinds of Greek lyric metra, including those found in tragic lyric, are (a) iambo-trochaic, including iambic (x—v), trochaic (—v—x), and dochmiac (x—x—); (b) dactylic (—vv); (c) ionic (vv—), including anacreontic (vv—vv—); (d) aeolic, with a so-called aeolic base of two syllables (oo), followed by one or more choriamb (—vv—) and ending with a one-syllable, two-syllable, three-syllable, or four-syllable *clausula*; sequences of choriamb, without the base or the close, are often found in aeolic contexts. A given strophe and antistrophe or other metrical sequence is usually described in terms of the kind of cola that are found in it. See the Key, below.

In *Philoktetes*, the most prevalent kind of lyric metre is aeolo-choriambic, which is found in strophe and antistrophe α and γ of the *parodos* (135–218), in the main stasimon (676–729), and in strophe and antistrophe α and β of the second *kommos* (1081–1168). Strophe and antistrophe β of the *parodos* are in aeolic metre; the metrically corresponding lyric outbursts in the first episode (391–402/507–18) are in syncopated iambic metre (i.e. iambic metre in which a light syllable is sometimes omitted before a heavy syllable) that defines itself as dochmiac in the final lines; the first *kommos* is mainly iambo-dochmiac in the strophe and antistrophe (827–38/839–54),¹²³ while the epode combines aeolic, dactylic, and iambic cola. Such a combination of several metrical families is common in the lyrics of Sophocles' late plays; the non-corresponding section of the second *kommos* (1169–1217) combines iambic, ionic-anacreontic, aeolo-choriambic, dactylic, and aeolic cola. See the commentary for metrical analyses of the play's lyric passages.

9 KEY TO METRICAL ABBREVIATIONS, TERMS, AND SYMBOLS

—	heavy element
v	light element
x	<i>anceps</i> element (may be heavy or light)
^	element omitted in syncopation
vv	resolution (two light elements taking the place of a heavy element)
:	indicates caesura in iambic trimeter
	period end (previous element counts as heavy regardless of vowel-length)
^b	period end with <i>brevis in longo</i> (in lyric stanzas it can occur in the strophe or the antistrophe or both)

¹²³ The traditional numbering of the lines, which goes back to the edition of P. Brunck (1786), does not reflect the reality that in this and other strophic pairs, a given strophe and antistrophe have the same number of lines.

^h	period end with hiatus (in lyric stanzas, it can occur in the strophe or the antistrophe or both)
^c	probable period end with a <i>clausula</i> occurring frequently in Greek lyric poetry
	end of lyric stanza
⌞, ≡	upper element refers to the strophe, lower element to the antistrophe
aceph.	acephalic (normal first element of the line omitted)
cat	catalectic (final element of the line omitted)
dim	dimeter
sync	syncopated (light element between two heavy elements omitted)
tetr	tetrameter
trim	trimeter
anacr	anacreontic (vv—vv—)
anap	anapaest (vv—v—)
ba	bacchiac (v—)
chor	choriamb (—vv—)
cr	cretic (—v—)
da	dactyl (—vv)
D	—vv—vv—
dochm	dochmiac (x—x—)
enhopl	enhoplian (v—vv—v—)
ia	iamb (x—v—)
ion	ionic (vv—)
ion colar	ionic colarion (v—vv—)
lekyth	lekythion (—v—x—v—)
mol	molossos (— — —)
paroem	paroemiac (vv—vv—vv—)
tr	trochee (—v—x)
oo	'aeolic base' (may be — —, —v, v—, but not vv)

Aeolic cola

aristoph	aristophanean (—vv—v—, often clausular)
chor dim	choriambic dimeter (—vv— —vv—)
chor dim A	choriambic dimeter A (—vv—x x x x)
chor dim B	choriambic dimeter B (x x x x—vv—)
dodr A	dodrans A (—vv—x—)
glyc	glyconic (oo—vv—v—)
greater Ascl	greater Asclepiadean (oo—vv— —vv— —vv—x—)
hag	hagesichorean (x—vv—v—)
hipp	hipponactean (oo—vv—v—, often clausular)
lesser Ascl	lesser Asclepiadean (oo—vv— —vv—x—)
phal	phalaecean (x—vv—v—v—)

pher	pherecratean (oo---, usually clausular)
reiz	reizianum (x---x)
tel	telesillean (x---)

10 RECEPTION

The reception of a work of literature, art, or thought includes both its interpretation by contemporary and later audiences, readers, and viewers and its translation, imitation, adaptation, re-figuration, or appropriation by later artists, writers, and thinkers for their own purposes.¹²⁴ From 409 BCE through to late antiquity, the reception of Sophokles' *Philoktetes* cannot always be distinguished from receptions of the Philoktetes-plays of Aischylos and Euripides and of other versions of the myth. From the early modern period to the present day, the reception of Sophokles' play and the reception of the myth are virtually identical. *Philoktetes* has not had as rich an afterlife as Sophokles' *Antigone* and *Oidipous the King*, but it has figured prominently at various cultural moments, when Philoktetes as the paradigmatic sufferer of physical and psychological pain and the political implications of Sophokles' play have engaged both ancient and modern writers and artists.

10.1 *The Hellenistic period*

At *Od.* 3.190, Nestor tells Telemachos that Philoktetes returned home 'well' after the Trojan War, but Hellenistic and Roman authors elaborated stories of his post-war adventures: either he returned home safely to Meliboia, but then had to leave because of political conflict, after which he sailed to Italy, landing near Croton; or he was blown off course on the way home, after the wreck of the Greek fleet at Cape Kaphereus in Euboia, and wandered to the Italian coast. When Philoktetes arrived, he fought the indigenous Campanians and founded Crimissa, north of Croton, and also, in some accounts, the nearby towns of Petelia and Chone. He built a temple to Apollo Alaios (Apollo the Wanderer) in Crimissa, where he dedicated his bow, which was later transferred to the temple of Apollo at Croton. Philoktetes died fighting on the side of Lindians from Rhodes, who had established themselves in Italy, against settlers from Pellene in Achaia; he was buried at Makalla (near Croton, on the Neaethus River) and worshipped in a hero-cult.¹²⁵ Presumably the development of the myth of Philoktetes in Italy has to do with various communities wishing to claim him as a local hero, in the way

¹²⁴ Cf. Hardwick 2003: 1–11.

¹²⁵ See *Lyc. Alex.* 911–28 with Tzetz. *ad Lyc. Alex.* 911, Strabo 6.1.3 (who says that Petelia was a Chonian settlement), [Apollod.] *Epit.* 6.15, 6.15b, [Arist.] *Mir.* 107, Euph. fr. 44, [45] Powell = 48, [209] Lightfoot. Cf. Giangiulio 1991, Musti 1991, Mauduit 1997, Malkin 1998a, 1998b: 214–33. Virgil *Aen.* 3.401–2 may imply that Philoktetes did not found Petelia but only fortified it. Cf. Servius on 3.402.

that other figures from the Trojan War, both Greek and Trojan, were claimed as founders or protectors, including Diomedes, Epeios, Nestor, and, most famously, Aineias.¹²⁶

10.2 Rome

The only known dramatic version of the myth of Philoktetes in Latin literature was the *Philocteta* of Accius (170–c. 86), of which about fifty lines survive in quotations by Latin authors from Cicero and Varro to Macrobius and Nonius (fr. 520–68 Ribbeck, fr. 522–70 Warmington). Accius seems to have based his play mainly on Euripides' *Philoctetes*, but also to have drawn on Aischylos and Sophokles. It is impossible to reconstruct the plot or recapture the themes in detail,¹²⁷ but clearly the play made an impression on Cicero, who quotes from it several times in philosophical contexts and at *Ad fam.* 7.33.1. In *Tusc. disp.* 2.7 he uses Philoctetes to show that, contrary to what Epicurus says, pain really is an evil, though Philoctetes' groaning should be allowed (*cui concedenti est gementi*) because he had seen Hercules shrieking in pain on Mt Oita; at 2.19 Philoctetes is an example of how the Epicurean notion that the most intense pain lasts only a short time is mistaken; and at 2.23 Cicero argues that 'in pain we must especially be on guard not to do anything in an abject, fearful, cowardly, servile, or womanish manner, and above all we should resist that famous Philoctetean outcry (*Philocteteus ille clamor*). Sometimes, though rarely, it is allowable for a man to groan, but shrieking (is allowable) not even for a woman'.¹²⁸ All told, for Cicero, Philoctetes is an example or symbol of unmanly, even effeminate, weakness and emotionality.¹²⁹

The best-known Latin version of the myth of Philoctetes after Accius emerges piecemeal in the debate between Ajax and Ulysses over the arms of Achilles in Book 13 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in which Ovid alludes to the stories, familiar from Cyclic epic, of Odysseus abandoning Philoctetes on Lemnos and bringing him back to the army ten years later. In the midst of his long speech (21–122), Ajax claims that if not for Ulysses, 'the Poiantian offspring' would not now be suffering as they say he is suffering on Lemnos: 'hidden in forest caves, | you move the rocks with groaning and curse the son of Laertes | as he deserves . . . broken by disease and hunger | he clothes and feeds himself by means of the birds, and pursuing them in flight | he uses the arrows owed by the fates to Troy' (47–54). Ulysses, in his even longer speech (128–381), disclaims responsibility, arguing that he should

¹²⁶ Cf. Malkin 1998b: 171–7, 214–57. ¹²⁷ Cf. Müller 1997: 260–84.

¹²⁸ Cicero quotes Accius by name in the first two passages, and in the third *Philocteteus ille clamor* is a clear allusion to the play. Cf. *De fin.* 2.32, 94.

¹²⁹ Several late texts accuse Philoktetes of being 'soft' or 'effeminate' sexually, e.g. Steph. Byz. *Ethnika* s.v. Μακάλλα (the name of the town came 'from Philoktetes having committed effeminate acts in it' (ἀπὸ τοῦ μαλακισθῆναι ἐν αὐτῇ Φιλοκλήτῃ)), Σ on Thuc. 1.12.2, Martial 2.84.1–2, Ausonius, *Epigrams* 75.2–3. Cf. Bowersock 1994: 62–4.

not be blamed 'because Vulcanian Lemnos holds the son of Poias' (313); that the army agreed when he himself 'urged | that Philoktetes should withdraw from the toil of the journey [to Troy] | and the war and try to soothe his savage pain with rest' (315-17); that only he himself, not Ajax, can restore Philoktetes to the army by a clever ruse (319-27). Finally, in an apostrophe to 'harsh Philoktetes', Ulysses promises to bring him back to the army, just as he had cleverly succeeded in capturing 'the Dardanian seer' [Helenus] and stealing the Palladion (329-38).

Owing to the popularity of the *Metamorphoses*, the references to the story of Philoktetes in Book 13 constituted the best-known version of the myth in western literature from late antiquity through the Middle Ages and Renaissance, until Sophokles' *Philoktetes* became familiar through the renewed study of Greek and especially by its translation into Latin (sixteenth century) and the modern European languages (eighteenth century).¹³⁰ At the same time, however, brief versions were available in scholia and mythological handbooks, which sometimes included realistic or rationalizing details in accordance with literary taste of the Hellenistic and imperial eras. For example, the *Kypria* and the Attic tragedians, as far as is known, did not explain why Philoktetes was bitten by the snake, except to say that that he transgressed a sacred space (cf. Soph. *Ph.* 1326-8). In later versions of the story, however, the snakebite is caused by Chryse, because Philoktetes rejected her love (Σ *Ph.* 194, Σ *Lyk. Alex.* 911), or by Hera, because Philoktetes helped in the cremation and apotheosis of Herakles whom she hated (Hyginos, *Fab.* 102). In Servius' distinctive version of the story (*ad Aen.* 3.402), Philoktetes is not bitten by a snake but drops one of the arrows, dipped by Herakles in the poisonous blood of the Lernaean Hydra, on his own foot. Although he had promised Herakles never to reveal the site of his grave, Philoktetes, when pressed to do so, had stamped with his foot on the spot; the accident with the arrow years later, resulting in injury to the same foot, was a punishment for breaking his promise.

10.3 *The early modern period*

The only known early modern drama based on the story of Philoktetes is Ortensio Scammacca's *Filottete*, a moralizing tragedy by the Sicilian Jesuit author of numerous works on classical and especially biblical themes.¹³¹ More significant for literary history is the well-known letter of 30 March 1576 from Torquato Tasso to Silvio Antoniano, in which Tasso discusses the composition of *Gerusalemme Liberata* and cites Odysseus in Sophokles' play telling Neoptolemos that both he and Philoktetes are necessary for the destruction of Troy (115). Tasso says, 'Perhaps I

¹³⁰ The earliest printed editions of Sophokles (Aldine, 1502; Juntine, 1522; Camerarius 1534, 1556; Turnebus, 1553) and the Latin translations by Gabia (1543), Lalamantius (1557), and Ratallerus (1576) must have made the biggest difference to wider knowledge of the play. For the earliest translations into modern languages, see below, pp. 47-8.

¹³¹ Scammacca 1641.

introduce this need for two persons in a better fashion, because there is a certain order of dependence and superiority between Rinaldo and Goffredo that is not seen between Pyrrhus (*sc.* Neoptolemos) and Philoktetes.' Tasso also mentions the need to recall Philoktetes from Lemnos as a precedent for Rinaldo having to be recalled from the Canary Islands in his own poem.¹³²

The only known visual representation of Philoktetes in Renaissance art is a characterizing relief by Giammaria Mosca, called Padovano (*c.* 1507–74), which reflects Servius' story of his self-inflicted wound.¹³³ This relief, four versions of which survive in museums in Cleveland, London, Mantua, and St Petersburg, shows Philoktetes seated on a tree trunk, fanning his injured right foot with a bird feather; three of the four versions have an inscription, clearly indebted to Servius, which states that 'the Poiantian hero suffers from the Lernaean wound'.¹³⁴ Another inscription on the back of the relief in St Petersburg, which was probably Padovano's prototype, shows that it was owned by the Bolognese humanist and poet, Gaspare di Carlo Antonio Fantuzzi (d. 1532), who 'dedicated (it)', perhaps on the occasion of his wedding to Dorotea Castelli, 'to the sweetest bond of marriage and to conjugal love'. A similar inscription on the back of a relief of Eurydice, also by Padovano and also owned by Fantuzzi, says, 'Gaspare Fantuzzi . . . installed (this) in remembrance of keeping faith.' Since in Servius' story Philoktetes injured himself with an arrow in the same foot with which he betrayed his promise to Herakles, perhaps the relief of Philoktetes should be 'understood as furnishing a negative example – that is, as attesting to the punishment awaiting betrayers of a sacred trust'.¹³⁵

Servius' story figures even more directly in chapter 12 of the didactic romance, *The Adventures of Telemachus, Son of Ulysses* (1699), by François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, political thinker, and tutor to the grandson of Louis XIV.¹³⁶ This influential work, frequently reprinted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, reflects Fénelon's pedagogical aims and sets forth his distinctive political vision of monarchy combined with republican virtue. It is set after the end of the Trojan War, when Telemachus has left Sparta and before he returns home to Ithaca (*cf.* *Od.* 15). He is accompanied on his 'adventures' by Minerva, disguised as Mentor, and though Telemachus is nominally the 'hero' of the fiction, in a sense the true 'hero' is Minerva, who educates him morally and civically and metamorphoses from Mentor into the goddess of Wisdom in the final chapter (18), when Telemachus is reunited with his father.¹³⁷

¹³² Tasso 1959: 780–1; *cf.* Alessandri 2010: 121. ¹³³ See Schulz 1998: 64–8.

¹³⁴ The relief seems to be modelled on a sardonix cameo by Boethos (second century BCE), which shows Philoktetes sitting on the ground and fanning his bandaged right foot (*LIMC* 34); *cf.* Schulz 1998: 66. Milani 1879: 86–7 mentions what may be an engraving of this gem by Enea Vico (1523–67).

¹³⁵ Schulz 1998: 68. ¹³⁶ Fénelon 1997 (Riley 1994).

¹³⁷ See Fénelon (Riley) 1994: xx–xxi.

In chapter 12, Telemachus and Minerva visit Philoctetes, who is reigning in Petelia in southern Italy (above, p. 43). Telemachus overcomes Philoctetes' initial hostility, which is based on his mistreatment by Ulysses, and Philoctetes tells Telemachus his life's story following the death of Hercules. This story includes (from Servius) Philoctetes' betrayal of the site of Hercules' grave (to Ulysses!) by stamping his foot on it and his later injury to the same foot with one of the poisoned arrows. Otherwise, it follows Sophokles' play closely in many details, but with four crucial differences: (1) Philoctetes tells Telemachus that when he raged at Ulysses and called on the gods to punish him, Ulysses was unshaken, 'like a rock on the top of a mountain, which bids defiance to the fury of the winds, and receives their rudest assaults unmoved';¹³⁸ (2) Ulysses commands Neoptolemus to restore the bow to Philoctetes, when he sees that he cannot be persuaded to come to Troy; (3) Ulysses does not flee when Philoctetes aims an arrow at him, but shows his courage and virtue by remaining unmoved in the face of danger; (4) Philoctetes is ashamed that 'in the heat of my passion I should have thought of employing my arms to take away the life of him who had caused them to be restored'.¹³⁹ In the end, Philoctetes confesses that he 'still retained a great antipathy to the sage Ulysses . . . but my acquaintance with his son . . . has softened my heart for the father himself'.¹⁴⁰ Thus Fénelon transforms Sophokles' Odysseus and offers a positive portrait in accordance with the goals of his own narrative.

10.4 *The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*

In the eighteenth century, Sophokles' *Philoctetes* played an important part in English, French, and German artistic representation and aesthetic discussions. This was partly a result of increased familiarity with the play through translations into various European languages. The first translation into English, by Thomas Sheridan, grandfather of the playwright, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, was published in 1725. It accompanied a production of the play in Greek by students in the Dublin school of which Sheridan was headmaster and was 'intended for the Lord-Lieutenant's wife (and perhaps other women in the audience)', who could not have been expected to be familiar with the story.¹⁴¹ English translations of Sophokles' seven surviving plays by George Adams and Robert Potter appeared in 1729 and 1788, respectively. The first French translation of *Philoctetes*

¹³⁸ Fénelon 1997: 206 (Fénelon (Riley) 1994: 209). For the simile, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.441–6.

¹³⁹ Fénelon 1997: 207 (Fénelon (Riley) 1994: 210).

¹⁴⁰ Fénelon 1997: 208 (Fénelon (Riley) 1994: 212).

¹⁴¹ Hall and Macintosh 2005: 246, cf. Hall 2008: 327. Perhaps because it has no female character, *Ph.* has often been performed at all-male schools. The *APGRD* database lists eight such productions between 1896 and 1970; cf. the school in which Philip Wakem reads *Ph.* in Greek in Book 2, chapter 6, of George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*. For the significance of the play and of all-male schooling in Eliot's novel, see Franken 1999; for their relevance to feminist literary scholarship, see Miller 1991.

by Pierre Brumoy was published, along with translations of the other surviving plays, in *Le théâtre des Grecs* (1730).¹⁴² The first German translation was by Johann Jakob Steinbrüchel (1760, repr. 1763), and the first into Italian was by Tommaso Giuseppe Farsetti (1767), followed by that of Vittorio Alfieri (1804).¹⁴³

In the eighteenth century, Sophokles' play influenced theatrical productions in England, France, and Germany. In England, it was a source for such contemporary versions of Greek drama as James Thomson's *Agamemnon* (1738) and William Mason's *Elfrida* (1752).¹⁴⁴ In France, as early as 1718, Voltaire introduced Philoktetes into his *Oedipe* as a suitor of Jocasta(!) and a suspect in the murder of Laius, until his exoneration in the final scene.¹⁴⁵ In 1755, Jean-Baptiste Vivien de Chateaubrun's *Philoctète* was staged at the Comédie Française, ran for seven performances, and was revived for five performances at some later date prior to 1780.¹⁴⁶ Superficially, this drama has little in common with Sophokles' play, apart from the name: in accordance with contemporary taste, Chateaubrun introduced a daughter of Philoctète, Sophie, who, with her nurse, Palmire, keeps him company on Lemnos and provides a love interest for Neoptolemos (called Pirrhos in the play), who is too pure to steal the bow as instructed by Odysseus (Ulysses). Chateaubrun, however, is true to the spirit of Sophokles' play in one respect: his *Philoctète* is a political drama, in which Ulysse is a cruel spokesman for the absolute power of the state, which, he says, should dominate in all aspects of human existence. At first this argument does not persuade Philoctète to accompany him to Troy, but when Ulysse offers to stay on Lemnos himself, if Philoctète will rejoin the army and help win the war, Philoctète changes his mind. In the end Ulysse triumphs in the name of *raison d'état*, and the play concludes with Philoctète bestowing Sophie on Pirrhos and the two men agreeing to sack Troy together.¹⁴⁷

Jean-François de la Harpe's phenomenally successful *Philoctète* was published in 1781, reprinted at least seven times between 1781 and 1843, and had eighty-six performances at the Comédie Française between 1783 and 1826.¹⁴⁸ Partly a translation and partly an adaptation of Sophokles' play, it was significantly shorter than the original, with no chorus and no False Merchant. De la Harpe reduced Neoptolemos' opposition to Odysseus and made Herakles intervene to save Odysseus' life at the moment when Philoktetes intends to shoot him, omitting most of lines 1300–1408 in the original, as well as Philoktetes' final farewell to

¹⁴² Sheridan 1725, Adams 1729, Potter 1788; Brumoy 1730, with English translation by C. Lennox *et al.*, 1759.

¹⁴³ For the first complete German translation of the seven plays, see Stolberg–Stolberg 1787; for the first complete Italian translation, Angelleli 1823–4. According to Mandel 1981:129, three Spanish translations of *Ph.* were published before 1780 and a Dutch translation in 1793. Philoktetes was a character in the opera *Medon, der König von Epirus*, first performed in Rome in 1780, cf. *OGCMA*: 2.893.

¹⁴⁴ Hall and Macintosh 2005: 110, 190–1. ¹⁴⁵ Cf. Alessandri 2009: 170.

¹⁴⁶ Mandel 1981: 130. ¹⁴⁷ Cf. H. Flashar 1999: 108–9, Fornaro 2006: 20–4.

¹⁴⁸ Lancaster 1953: 41, cited by Mandel 1981: 132–3.

the island (1452–68). On the other hand, he also added dialogue, marked in his printed text by inverted commas, to clarify points in the original that might not have been understood by his audience.¹⁴⁹

A.-F.-C. Ferrand's *Philoctète, tragédie en 3 actes, et en vers, imitée de Sophocle* (1786) and Étienne Méhul's *Philoctète à Lemnos* (1788), an opera with a libretto by A. Renou, the music of which is now lost, were much less successful than the dramas of Chateaubrun and de la Harpe, but provide additional evidence of the popularity of Philoktetes on stage in eighteenth-century France. So, too, do Diderot's references to Philoktetes in *Entretiens sur le Fils naturel* (1757), where the Rousseau-like Dorval argues for truth to nature in theatrical productions, praises Sophokles' depiction of Philoktetes' pain at 745–6, and cries out for 'La Vérité! La Nature! Les Anciens! Sophocle! Philoctète!'¹⁵⁰ In Diderot's *Paradoxe sur le comédien* (1773–7), the First Speaker tells the Second Speaker that he is 'pleased to hear Philoctète speak with such simplicity and force to Neoptolème, who gives him the arrows of Hercule that he had stolen at the instigation of Ulysse'.¹⁵¹

Another dimension of the eighteenth-century French reception of Sophokles' *Philoctetes* can be seen in the use of 'Philoctète' as the pen name of Antoine Allègre, a prisoner in the Bastille, who 'in 1753 devised a clandestine postal system used by both detainees and persons on the outside', until it was discovered after a few months. Several letters addressed to 'Philoctète' by the imprisoned Protestant writer Angliviel de la Beaumelle, using the name 'Uranie', survive, as do others signed by 'Philoctète' and addressed to the geographer and explorer, Charles Marie de La Condamine.¹⁵² These letters suggest, among other things, that Allègre and his correspondents shared a familiarity with Sophokles' play, based either on Brumoy's translation or on the Greek original. As Elizabeth Wingrove notes, Allègre's letters repeatedly lament his wretched isolation and speak of friendship, two topics familiar from the play. She argues that 'the letters Allègre wrote and received as Philoctète imply that his "communicative desires" resemble those of Philoktetes in Sophocles' play' (cf. lines 234–5), and that they have the same power to create or renew his 'world' in the Bastille that conversation in Greek with Neoptolemos had to renew Philoktetes' world on Lemnos.¹⁵³ More generally, the letters of 'Philoctète' demonstrate how Sophokles' play could be used politically, not only, as in Chateaubrun's *Philoctète*, to affirm the power of

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Todd 1972: 121; H. Flashar 1999: 109.

¹⁵⁰ Diderot 1959: 90, 120. Cf. Korzeniewski 2003: 516–7, Budelmann 2007: 454–5.

¹⁵¹ Diderot 1959: 359. The First Speaker may refer to lines 1310–13 of Sophokles' play, but it is uncertain whether, as 'hear' (*entendre*) might suggest, he has in mind an actual stage production. He cannot be thinking of Chateaubrun's play, in which Philoctète never loses control of the arrows, or of de la Harpe's translation, which was performed for the first time in 1783. Perhaps another, unknown *Philoctète* was staged between 1755 and 1773, or perhaps Diderot (or someone else) revised the manuscript of *Paradoxe sur le comédien* at a later date, before it was published in 1830.

¹⁵² Wingrove 2010: 65. ¹⁵³ *Ibid.*: 71–4.

the state, but also to resist this power in a gesture of individual self-assertion and self-worth.

There is no record of any eighteenth-century German theatrical production either of Sophokles' *Philoktetes* or of a modern adaptation, but in the second half of the century Philoktetes and his pain figure importantly in debates among leading theorists and critics on aesthetics and the theatrical representation of pain.¹⁵⁴ J. J. Winckelmann began the debate in his *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (1755). Discussing the suffering of Laocoön, in the statue-group housed in the Vatican Museum, Winckelmann comments, 'Laocoön suffers, but he suffers like Sophokles' Philoktetes. His misery touches our soul, but we wish we could bear misery like this great man.'¹⁵⁵ Then he makes the generalizing claim that Laocoön suffered his pain with the calm and composure, 'the noble simplicity and tranquil grandeur (*edle Einfalt und stille Größe*)', that characterized Greek art and literature 'of the best period'.¹⁵⁶ In other words, for Winckelmann Philoktetes is a stoic figure of the emotional restraint and self-control that were the hallmarks of classical Greek art in its fullest flowering.

In his *Laocoön, or On the Boundaries of Painting and Sculpture* (1766), G. E. Lessing criticized Winckelmann's judgement regarding Sophokles' Philoktetes and the representation of pain in classical Greek literature and art more generally.¹⁵⁷ While Lessing agrees that in the famous statue-group of Laocoön and his sons, Laocoön suffers nobly and with emotional restraint, he maintains, against Winckelmann, that Philoktetes' suffering is quite different: "Laocoön suffers like Sophokles' Philoktetes." But how does this man suffer? ... His laments, his screaming, his savage curses ... rang ... through the empty island ... What sounds of anger, of misery, of despair, which the poet in his imitation made ring through the theatre.'¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, for Lessing, the cries and shrieks with which Philoktetes responds to his pain and expresses his feelings are in accordance with nature and help to generate the pity/compassion (*Mitleid*) that an audience feels for him and the emotional impact of Sophokles' play.¹⁵⁹

Lessing's emphasis on the natural is in line with Diderot's emphasis on 'truth' and 'nature' in his opposition to neo-classical notions of decorum in theatrical production.¹⁶⁰ His criticism of Winckelmann, however, provoked a response by J. G. Herder in *Erstes kritisches Wäldchen Herrn Lessings Laokoon gewidmet* (*First Critical Groves Dedicated to Herr Lessing's Laocoön*) (1769), the first of four volumes

¹⁵⁴ Weissberg 1989: 559–67, Budelmann 2007: 453–7.

¹⁵⁵ Winckelmann 1982: 18 (trans. Budelmann). ¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 22.

¹⁵⁷ Lessing 1990: 11–206. Cf. Korzeniewski 2003 and, more briefly, Fornaro 2006: 25–8.

¹⁵⁸ Lessing 1990: 18.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Lessing's discussion of *Mitleid* in *Hamburg Dramaturgy* (1767–9), on Aristotle's theory of *katharsis* in the *Poetics*.

¹⁶⁰ Lessing translated Diderot's *Le fils naturel* and *Le père de la famille*, as well as the supplemental discourses, in *Theater des Herrn Diderot* (1760).

of his *Kritische Wälder* (*Critical Forests*). Herder sided with Winckelmann on the subject of Philoktetes' pain, which, he argued, is expressed with restraint in Sophokles' play. He used Odysseus' report of Philoktetes' disturbing the camp with his cries to support the position that physical pain should be narrated rather than represented on stage, despite Philoktetes' own, repeated cries in the vivid representation of his paroxysm at the heart of Sophokles' play (730–826), which Diderot had praised as natural.¹⁶¹ Herder returned to Philoktetes over and over in both theoretical and creative work, which included, in addition to the discussion in *Critical Forests*, a brief comment at the beginning of his *Essay on the Origin of Language* on Philoktetes as a 'suffering animal' and his cries as a form of self-expression;¹⁶² two translation-adaptations of epigrams in the Greek Anthology on images of Philoktetes; and a libretto, *Philoktetes: Scenes with Song*, which was set to music (now lost) by J. C. F. Bach (1774). The poems, 'Philoktetes' (after 1789) and 'On an Image of Philoktetes' (1782, not Herder's title), are based on *AP* 16.112 and *AP* 16.113, respectively (see above, p. 9).¹⁶³ The libretto consists of a duet for Neoptolemos and Philoktetes, with a chorus of Nymphs of the Island (Herder omits Odysseus and the False Merchant). In places the language recalls the second *kommos* in Sophokles' play, but it is focused on the ability to control physical suffering. By pitying Philoktetes, Neoptolemos gradually persuades him to modify his hatred of Odysseus and the sons of Atreus, which only intensifies his physical pain. As Philoktetes begins to do so and seems to be changing his mind about staying on Lemnos, Neoptolemos returns the bow; at this point Herakles appears suddenly in the bright sky and commands Philoktetes to go to Troy to win glory for himself and the bow, and Philoktetes agrees to yield to destiny and accompany Neoptolemos to victory at Troy.¹⁶⁴

In addition to serving as a dramatic hero and the focus of aesthetic discussion, Philoktetes became an increasingly common subject of visual representation in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, especially in France, and the vogue for paintings and statues of Philoktetes suffering on Lemnos and of other scenes from the myth continued through the nineteenth century.¹⁶⁵ The earliest painting, by James Barry (1770), is a particularly interesting illustration of the complexity of artistic reception. It is based not only on Sophokles' play but on the epigram by Glaukos describing Parrhasios' painting of Philoktetes, in whose 'parched eyes a tear dwells | mutely, and the wasting pain is within him' (*AP* 16.111.3–4; above, p. 9); it also recalls the Belvedere torso, which Winckelmann had praised as representing 'the utmost perfection of ancient sculpture' and Barry admired for

¹⁶¹ Herder 1993: 69–73, 95–107; Diderot 1959: 90. Cf. Fornaro 2006: 38–44.

¹⁶² Gaier 1985: 253. Cf. Weissberg 1989: 548–51, 564–5.

¹⁶³ Cf. Herder 1882: 82, 121. For brief discussion of both texts, see Weissberg 1989: 565.

¹⁶⁴ For a discussion and translation of *Philoktetes: Scenes with Song*, see Fornaro 2006: 44–51, 89–107, based on the text in Redlich 1884: 69–78. Cf. Borgards 2002.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. *OGCMA*: 2. 893–5, Mandel 1981: 135–47, plates 7–19, Alessandri 2009: figures 2–3, 5–17.

the 'perfect unison' in which its parts expressed the 'idea of corporeal force'.¹⁶⁶ Barry's painting is also in accord with Lessing's dictum, in chapter 3 of *Laocöon*, that the most extreme point of an emotion is the least profitable for an artist to represent, because it does not allow the viewer's imagination to soar beyond the particular moment, but 'binds its wings'.¹⁶⁷ There is no deformity caused by emotion in Barry's Philoktetes, who should perhaps be understood to be in a state of exhaustion, after one of his paroxysms has run its course, or anticipating the next outbreak.

In some late eighteenth-century paintings of Philoktetes, such as that of Nicolai Abildgaard (1774–5), a fierce, almost romantic wildness prevails over Winckelmannesque ideals of composed manliness, courage, and beauty. Most of the images, however, like Barry's painting, conform to neo-classical ideals and, especially in the nineteenth century, often have 'a grave purity and luminous polish' associated with Beaux-Arts style.¹⁶⁸ As a rule, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century paintings depict Philoktetes alone on Lemnos, either struggling to master his pain or having mastered it, and only a few include two or more figures. Of these, the most remarkable is a watercolour drawing by William Blake, *Philoktetes and Neoptolemos on Lemnos* (1812), which, as might be expected, is utterly different from other images of Philoktetes in this period. It is the only one to show Philoktetes beardless, with no trace of pain. It is also the only representation of a theatrical scene, probably including Odysseus and two attendants (or perhaps two members of a chorus), though the scene is not from Sophokles' play or from any other known dramatic work.¹⁶⁹

While most eighteenth-century receptions of Philoktetes focus on his physical agony and emotional distress at having been betrayed by his comrades and exiled from his community, some representations, after the French revolution, have a political emphasis. For example, *Nicolas Philoctète dans l'île d'Elbe* (1814–15), a colour print by an unknown artist,¹⁷⁰ is an anti-Napoleonic caricature of Guillaume Guillon-Lethière's well-known painting, *Philoktetes on the Desert island of Lemnos, Scaling the Rocks to Reach a Bird he has Killed* (1798). The caricature substitutes a portrait of Napoleon in exile on Elba for the exiled Philoktetes in Guillon-Lethière's painting. Napoleon is in military uniform, but his right leg is bare from the knee down, with a bandage visible, and the sleeve of his right arm, reaching for the bird, is rolled up. This rolled-up sleeve lends force to a pun in the caricature's subtitle, *N'a jamais passé la Manche*, which means both 'always sleeveless' and 'never crossed the Channel', with reference to Napoleon's unfulfilled intent to invade England.

¹⁶⁶ Lyles and Hamlyn 1997: 116. The Belvedere torso has also been associated with Philoktetes by Andrén 1952, Simon 1996: 36–8.

¹⁶⁷ Lessing 1990: 32. Cf. Lyles and Hamlyn 1997: 116. ¹⁶⁸ Mandel 1981: 136–7.

¹⁶⁹ Mandel 1981: 139–40, plate 12; Alessandri 2009: figure 11; Butlin 1981: Cat. 676.

¹⁷⁰ Alessandri 2009: figure 13.

An even more charged political reception of Sophokles' *Philoktetes* was its translation into modern Greek in 1818 by Nikolaos Pikkolou. This translation, the first of a complete ancient Greek tragedy into the modern language, was intended as a patriotic expression of Greek national identity and a cultural contribution to the 'Greek Enlightenment', which aimed to bring the intellectual and political values of Enlightenment Europe into the Greek-speaking world. Pikkolou's *Philoktetes* was performed several times in Odessa in 1818, where the Greek community, in particular the Society of Friends (*Philiki Hetaireia*), was organizing the movement for Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire that led to the revolution of 1821.¹⁷¹ It seems to have been performed again in Tenos in 1822, and there were other productions in modern Greek in 1858 and 1889 and in ancient Greek in 1887.¹⁷² These are the only recorded nineteenth-century productions of Sophokles' play.

10.5 *The twentieth and twenty-first centuries*

In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries there have been *c.* eighty productions of the play in various languages and translations and *c.* thirty productions of dramatic adaptations, most in the past fifty years, and the list is constantly growing.¹⁷³ Individual productions or adaptations tend to emphasize such themes as *Philoktetes*' physical pain and psychological suffering; his struggle to overcome the hatred and bitterness resulting from betrayal by his comrades and nine years of exile; the relative merits of honour, power, and expediency as principles of personal and political life; contrasts and conflicts between innocence and experience, ends and means, and individual inclinations and the needs and demands of society. Many of the adaptations are highly idiosyncratic and less concerned with fidelity to Sophokles' play than with transforming it in order to intervene in contemporary debates and for their own artistic purposes.

In André Gide's symbolist *Philoctète ou le traité des trois morales* (1899), for example, the hero is exiled in a dark wasteland of ice and snow, which resembles Sophokles' Lemnos only in being a kind of landscape of the soul.¹⁷⁴ The 'three ethics' are the patriotic loyalty of Ulysses to 'Greece' and the war against Troy, Néoptolème's love

¹⁷¹ Cf. Ipitis 1818: 577, 586–8, Zakynthios 1818: 682, Klimatiotis 1819: 359–60, Sideris 1970: 175, 178, 1976: 17–18; Martini 1974: 75–6; Spathis 1978–9: 265–71, Topouzis 1992: 166–7.

¹⁷² Topouzis 1992: 167. Cf. Martini 1974: 77.

¹⁷³ For a list of productions since 1725, see the *APGRD* database, s.v. *Philoktetes*: <http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/research-collections/performance-database>. For interpretive discussions of selected twentieth- and early twenty-first-century dramatic adaptations, see Lefèvre 2012. The most recent production of Sophokles' play, sponsored by the Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico, took place in the ancient theatre at Siracusa in May–June, 2011; the most recent adaptation is Siméon 2009.

¹⁷⁴ Gide 1941: 111–63; translation by J. Matthews in Mandel 1981: 157–78. Cf. Alessandri and Massenzio 2009: 197–202, Alessandri 2009: 177–82.

of 'virtue' and Philoctète, and Philoctète's personal concern for self-fulfilment through transcendence into a realm of pure being. When Philoctète realizes that Néoptolème has betrayed him at the instigation of Ulysse, he chooses to profit from the betrayal and voluntarily drinks a sleeping potion, which allows Néoptolème and Ulysse to steal the bow and leave him behind. His last words are, 'They will never come back; they have no more bows to seek . . . I am happy,' and the final stage direction expresses his fruitful and fulfilling transcendence: '*his voice has become extraordinarily mild and beautiful; around him flowers are showing through the snow, and birds from heaven come down to feed him*'.

Philoktet (1965), by the East German playwright Heiner Müller, takes place in a de-heroized world in which the only 'ethics' are Philoktetes' intense hatred for Odysseus and the Greeks; Neoptolemos' ambition, impulsiveness, and competing loyalty to his mission and ethical misgivings about the deception it involves; Odysseus' cruelty and opportunistic willingness to do anything, no matter how base and disgusting, in order to win the war.¹⁷⁵ The style is a mixture of high and low, as reflected in the combination of *Knittelreim* (a doggerel verse form) in the Prologue and heroic blank verse. The language and dramatic action blend tragedy, comedy, and satire in a way that recalls Euripides' *Orestes* and, even more, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* in its undermining of traditional values. All three characters, especially Philoktetes, speak at length in a furiously abusive style (like Shakespeare's Thersites), which is utterly at odds with their heroic pretensions. In the end, Philoktetes rejects both Neoptolemos' offer to return the bow and Odysseus' offer to remain on the island, if Philoktetes will go to Troy to help win the war. Then, when Odysseus and Neoptolemos are fighting with one another, Philoktetes steals back the bow and is about to shoot Odysseus, when he is literally stabbed in the back and killed by Neoptolemos. His death seems to make winning the war impossible, given Odysseus' earlier explanation of why they have come to Lemnos, but like the effective political leader that he is, Odysseus improvises a lying story for Neoptolemos to tell the army. Then the two set off for Troy, with Odysseus carrying the bow and Neoptolemos packing the corpse on his back to serve as evidence in support of Odysseus' lie.

On the surface, Müller's *Philoktet* might seem like theatre of the absurd, but it is better thought of as a problem play that offers a powerful critique of political leaders, all of whom share an appetite for power and disposition to brutality that make Müller's supposedly heroic world of the play seem like a Hobbesian state of nature. In an interview, Müller described *Philoktet* as presenting 'three false

¹⁷⁵ See Müller 2000: 289–327. Translation by N. McBride in Müller 2011: 27–68, which also includes an introduction by U. Schütte (1–26); Müller's '*PHILOCTETES; three points*', 'Farewell to the Lehrstück', and 'Letter to the Director of the First Bulgarian Production of *PHILOCTETES* at the Drama Theatre, Sofia'; and D. Kranz's 'Conversation with Heiner Müller [on *PHILOCTETES*]'. For a similarly useful collection of material, see Müller 2003. Cf. Alessandri and Massenzio 2009: 203–7, Alessandri 2009: 183–92.

attitudes to reality, to history',¹⁷⁶ and these false attitudes challenge an audience or readers to consider what might be a true one. The play, begun just a year after the death of Stalin, has sometimes been associated with the rehabilitation of members of the Communist Party, who had been imprisoned or persecuted by the East German Stalinist regime in a betrayal of revolutionary ideals, and the effort to recruit them to participate in society and a renewed revolution. Yet it depicts the leaders of the society in which Philoktetes would 'participate' as so cynical and self-serving, that the only attitude it might suggest to viewers or readers is that society is not worth participating in, without a radical political transformation that would be truly revolutionary.¹⁷⁷

The Cure at Troy: a version of Sophocles' Philoktetes (1990) by the Irish poet Seamus Heaney brings Sophokles' play into dialogue with Irish colonial history and contemporary politics, in an attempt to overcome the longstanding practice by both Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland of destructively and self-destructively clinging to the past. Heaney's drama reworks Sophokles' play in a post-colonial voice and perspective that are true to the complexities of the conflict in Northern Ireland. For example, while Odysseus and Neoptolemos may be seen to correspond to Protestant colonizers and Philoktetes to the Catholic colonized, at the same time Philoktetes can be seen as the besieged, like the minority Protestants, and Odysseus and Neoptolemos as their besiegers. Sophokles' play is an obvious model for an attempt to point to a way beyond the impasse in Northern Ireland, insofar as it ends by transcending the psychological impossibility of Philoktetes going to Troy because of his hatred of Odysseus and the sons of Atreus. His decision to rejoin the Greek army allows history to take its destined and (from the audience's viewpoint) desired course. Heaney's dialogue is relatively faithful to Sophokles' version, but his female Chorus is a radical innovation, given that *Philoktetes* is the only surviving Attic tragedy with no female character and that the choral prologue and, especially, the final song have no precedent in Sophokles; both lyrics are rich in language that specifically evokes the conflict between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. One main difference in the endings of the two plays is that Sophokles' Herakles speaks with certainty in the indicative, while Heaney's Chorus, acknowledging that 'No poem or play or song | Can fully right a wrong | Inflicted and endured', can only call on Philoktetes, Odysseus, Neoptolemos, and the audience or reader to 'hope for a great sea-change | On the far side of revenge'. The Chorus' language recalls Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, where victims of the tragedy of shipwreck 'suffer a sea-change | Into something rich and strange', and this allusion to another play in which an island-exile forgives the unforgivable and chooses to return home

¹⁷⁶ Quoted by Schütte at Müller 2011: 12.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Schütte in Müller 2011: 13–14. Müller's early poem 'Philoktet' (1950) is less jaundiced in its suggestion that the individual should serve political and historical necessity. Cf. Müller 1998: 15, Müller at Müller 2011: 107.

strengthens the dénouement of Heaney's play, despite its ending merely on a note of hope.

In addition to these dramatic adaptations, there have been a variety of recent fictional re-workings of Sophokles' play, in which the changes often have special significance by implicit contrast with the Sophoklean model. For instance, in Kay Cicellis' novella *The Return* (1960), set in the aftermath of the Greek Civil War of 1946–9, and Robert Silverberg's science fiction novel *The Man in the Maze* (1969), the Philoktetes figure is self-exiled, has adequate resources with which to survive comfortably, and therefore no motivation to depart from his refuge.¹⁷⁸ Mark Merlis' post-modern novel of modern gay life, *An Arrow's Flight*, generates much of its meaning by being set both in a clearly contemporary, American gay culture and at the time of the Trojan War. When Pyrrhos (Neoptolemos) joins the army and goes to war, the novel revises a central theme of Sophokles' play by depicting the claims on an individual not only of friendship but of erotic love in opposition to the claims of the state.¹⁷⁹

Other modern versions of *Philoktetes* can be at least as idiosyncratic as the fictional adaptations. Some poems resonate directly with Sophokles' play and the traditional myth, for example, J. Byrne Leicester Warren de Tabley's dramatic monologue, 'Philoktetes', in which the hero expresses his physical and emotional pain, unwavering hatred for his enemies, and hope for revenge (cf. Poole 1987: 195–7, 202–3), and Michael Ondaatje's 'Philoktetes on the Island' and 'The Goodnight', which focus, respectively, on Philoktetes' relation to the natural world on Lemnos and on his killing of Paris.¹⁸⁰ Others have little to do with Philoktetes himself as represented by Sophokles: for example, in Paul Goodman's poem 'Philoktetes' (1941), Philoktetes speaks of his wound as his past, which 'I keep open and . . . clean out, | It will not infect me if I nurse it like a stranger, | . . . | I have come to this island to enjoy in solitude | the foreign body imbedded in my quick' – until unbearable pain makes him scream in inarticulate agony.¹⁸¹ Edmund Wilson's influential essay, 'The Wound and the Bow', published in the same year as Goodman's poem, sees the wound as symbolizing the suffering that is the inevitable concomitant of great artistic power.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Cf. the similar situation of self-exile in Sydney Bernard Smith's *Sherca: a play in three scenes after Sophocles' Philoktetes* (1979). For *The Return*, see Cicellis 1960: 65–105. On Silverberg's novel, see Ciani 1981.

¹⁷⁹ Merlis compares his use of the myth of Philoktetes to 'frame a story of modern gay life' to Christopher Logue's 'account' of the *Iliad* in *War Music*. Cf. <http://www.markmerlis.com/Hellenic2.htm> (accessed on 8 January 2012).

¹⁸⁰ de Tabley 1903: 30–2, reprinted in Poole 1987: 240–2; Ondaatje 1989: 17–19. Cf. Wordsworth's sonnet, 'When Philoktetes in the Lemnian Isle' (1827), which describes the companionship and comfort provided by nature to Philoktetes, when his comrades have abandoned him. J. Mayrhofer's ten-line poem, 'Philoktetes' (1817), set to music by Franz Schubert (D540), expresses Philoktetes' helplessness after Odysseus and Neoptolemos have taken his bow, as well as his warning to Odysseus to fear the goddess Nemesis.

¹⁸¹ Goodman 1962: 39–40. ¹⁸² Wilson 1941.

Contemporary poets, too, build on Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, or rather, his Philoktetes, for their own poetic purposes. Adrienne Rich, in the seventh poem in *Twenty-one Love Poems* (1974–6),¹⁸³ envisions herself as 'Philoktetes | in woman's form, limping the long path, | lying on a headland over the dark sea', only to reject this identification when she speaks of herself as wanting and willing to risk a new – and new kind of – relationship, rather than (she implies) continue her familiar suffering, as Philoktetes did when he chose to stay on the island. 'The woman who cherished | her suffering is dead. I am her descendant. | I love the scar-tissue she handed on to me, | but I want to go on from here with you | fighting the temptation to make a career of pain.'

In Derek Walcott's *Omeros*, the indigenous black fisherman, Philoctete, suffers from a wound in his foot, which symbolizes the 'suffering of Afro-Caribbean peoples under European colonialism and slavery'.¹⁸⁴ Philoctete himself, who in the first tercet of the poem 'smiles for the tourists, who try taking | his soul with their cameras' (1.1.2–3: 3), stands for the exploited victims of this colonialism, whom the colonists rejected or used for their own profit, as the Greeks rejected and then used Philoktetes. The very name Philoctete, a characteristic imposition of the Mediterranean on the Caribbean, is analogous to the wound 'Which will never heal' (1.11.3: 19).¹⁸⁵ Philoctete does not understand the significance of his name, and at one point he imagines it as a sickness that could be cut from his body: 'What did it mean | this name that felt like a fever? Well, one good heft | of his garden-cutlass would slice the damned name | clean from its rotting yam (1.14.1: 219–20).'¹⁸⁶ It is no accident that when Philoctete is healed of his wound, 'The yoke of the wrong name lifted from his shoulders' (6.XLIX.2: 247).

Ursula Krechel's *Stimmen aus dem harten Kern* (2005) consists of twelve sequences, each sequence comprising twelve twelve-line poems voiced by victims of war, from the Trojan and Peloponnesian Wars to the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan by the United States in the early twenty-first century.¹⁸⁷ The eleventh sequence is dedicated exclusively to Philoktetes, who laments both his suffering on the island and his rejoining the army at Troy. His painful wound is unique and distinctive, but his victimization by 'history' is familiar, and his voice blends with the voices of others whom war has damaged that are heard in the other eleven sequences.

In a related but perhaps more constructive vein, since 2005 the Theater of War, formerly known as The Philoktetes Project, has given readings of scenes from *Philoktetes* and, more recently, from Sophokles' *Ajax*.¹⁸⁸ These readings were first addressed to physicians and medical students concerned with treating the physical and emotional pain of active duty soldiers and veterans of the wars in

¹⁸³ Rich 1978: 28–9. ¹⁸⁴ Ramazani 1997: 405.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Greenwood 2010: 20–58, esp. 23–35. ¹⁸⁶ Cf. Ramazani 1997: 413.

¹⁸⁷ Translation by A. K. Strawson in Krechel 2009.

¹⁸⁸ The Philoktetes Project/Theater of War is one project of Outside the Wire, 'a social impact company that uses theater . . . to address pressing public health and social issues'. Cf. <http://www.philoktetesproject.org>.

Iraq and Afghanistan, with a focus on patient-caregiver interactions. Since 2008 the readings have been presented mainly to soldiers and veterans themselves, especially those suffering both from physical wounds and from post-traumatic stress syndrome and its attendant disposition to violence. The aim is to help them overcome stigmas resulting from physical and psychological injuries through identification with characters in the plays; to encourage them to resist feelings of isolation and helplessness and to express their feelings and thoughts about their injuries by helping them to see their own difficulties in a broader historical and cultural context.

11 THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT

The most authoritative texts of *Philoktetes* are based on fewer than twenty mediaeval manuscripts.¹⁸⁹ The two oldest date from the mid-tenth century, about 1450 years after the first production of *Philoktetes*; the rest were written in the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. All these manuscripts go back to the texts of Sophokles established by Alexandrian editors, especially Aristophanes of Byzantium, during the Hellenistic period. These editors based their work on the best earlier texts they could find, perhaps including the official Athenian text of c. 330 BCE, from which actors were forbidden to deviate in new productions. It is unclear whether this 'official' text of Sophokles was based on a copy or copies that had been in circulation in the playwright's lifetime or on later copies that had doubtless undergone modification in the c. seventy-five years since his death. Scholars in the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods re-edited the Alexandrian texts and enriched them with commentary, some of which is preserved in the *scholia* that accompany the text in several surviving manuscripts.

Sophokles' plays were not as widely read or as frequently performed as those of Euripides in the Hellenistic and Roman eras, and *Philoktetes* was perhaps not one of Sophokles' most popular works. Nevertheless, Sophokles was always one of the ἐγκριθέντες, the canonical authors, and his plays were regularly studied in schools and worked on by scholars, to judge from the fairly extensive *scholia* (which are, however, more limited in the case of *Philoktetes* than for any of the other surviving plays). *Philoktetes* was included, probably in the second century CE, in at least one selection of seven plays, perhaps intended for use in schools; this selection survived into the mediaeval period, was copied and recopied, and eventually became the basis of all known manuscripts and modern editions.

Only one papyrus fragment of *Philoktetes* has been found: *P. Berol.* inv. 17058 (fourth-fifth century) has parts of lines 419–21 and 452–4, but does not contribute anything new textually. In addition, *P. Vindob.* G inv. 29779 = *P. Rain.* 24 (fourth-fifth century) has fragments of a life of Sophokles and of several *hypotheses*,

¹⁸⁹ See Turyn 1952, Dawe 1973–8, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990: vi–xiii, xix, Avezzù 2003: lvi–lxxxix, and the brief summary in Griffith 1999: 66–8.

some familiar from the mediaeval manuscripts and others previously unknown, including an unknown *hypothesis* to *Philoktetes* (fr. 2).¹⁹⁰

Philoktetes is occasionally quoted, paraphrased, or referred to, sometimes inaccurately, by a variety of ancient and, especially, Byzantine authors, including Aristotle, Stobaios, Hesychios, Photios, the *Suda*, Tzetzes, Zonaras, and Eustathios.¹⁹¹ These quotations and testimonia sometimes confirm and sometimes call into question the readings of the manuscripts. For the most part, however, a modern edition is dependent on the manuscripts and, when these seem to be in error, on conjectural emendation. Occasionally, when no reading or conjecture seems plausible, scholars acknowledge this by printing daggers, e.g. at *Ph.* 1139.

¹⁹⁰ See Van Rossum-Steenbeck 1998: 34–5, 231–2.

¹⁹¹ See Avezzi 2003 for references to such quotations and *testimonia*.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT AND *APPARATUS CRITICUS*

In this edition I have kept the *apparatus criticus* extremely short and simple and made no effort to record specific MS sources and affiliations. Rather, I have used the following symbols:

- Ω reading of all or most MSS
- Φ reading of a minority of MSS¹
- Σ reading expressed or implied by one or more scholia
- T reading of the Triklinian MSS likely in some cases to be an emendation by D. Triklinios
- B reading found in an ancient or Byzantine citation or quotation.

When I print the reading of the majority of MSS (Ω), and it is obvious which word(s) are at issue, I include only the reading(s) of the minority of MSS in the *apparatus*. In noting variant readings, I have excluded orthographical details that do not affect the meaning or metre.

My text and *apparatus criticus* are based on the editions of Avezzù, Dawe, and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson. For fuller description and reporting of specific MSS and their affiliations, the reader should consult these editions and Dawe 1973–8. Avezzù's edition includes fuller information about *testimonia*. For the *hypotheses*, see the text and *apparatus criticus* in Janz 166–7.

When a scholar is known to have anticipated a published conjecture in an unpublished marginal note in a book that he owned (cf. Finglass 2009b, 2011), I have indicated in the *apparatus criticus* both the scholar who first published the conjecture and, in parentheses, the scholar who anticipated it. For example, 228 κακούμενον Brunck (pr. Valckenaer) means that Brunck first published the conjecture κακούμενον, but was preceded by Valckenaer in a marginal note.

¹ Φ may indicate a half a dozen or more MSS, or just one or two, or merely a variant written or reported in the margin or between the lines.

ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ

ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΟΥ

Ἀπαγωγή Φιλοκτῆτου ἐκ Λήμνου εἰς Τροίαν ὑπὸ Νεοπτολέμου καὶ Ὀδυσσέως καθ' Ἑλένου μαντείαν, ὃς κατὰ μαντείαν Κάλχαντος, ὡς εἰδὼς χρησμούς συντελοῦντας πρὸς τὴν τῆς Τροίας ἄλωσιν, ὑπὸ Ὀδυσσέως νύκτωρ ἐνεδρευθεὶς, δέσμιος ἦχθη τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. ἡ δὲ σκηνὴ ἐν Λήμνῳ. ὁ δὲ χορὸς ἐκ γερόντων τῷ Νεοπτολέμῳ συμπλεόντων. κείται καὶ παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ ἡ μυθοποιία. ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππου. πρῶτος ἦν Σοφοκλῆς.

5 τῷ ὦ: τῶν Φ: τῶν τῷ Φ καὶ Φ: ὡς ὦ 5-7 κείται... Σοφοκλῆς omitted
Φ 6-7 πρῶτος... Σοφοκλῆς ὦ: ἦν or ἡ σοφός Φ

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΟΥ ΕΜΜΕΤΡΟΣ

Ἐν Χρύσει Ἀθηνᾶς βωμὸν ἐπικεχωσμένον,
ἐφ' οὐπὲρ Ἀχαιοῖς χρησθὲν ἦν θῦσαι, μόνος
Ποίαντος ἥιδει παῖς ποθ' Ἡρακλεῖ ξυνών.
ζητῶν δὲ τοῦτον ναυβάτηι δεῖξαι στόλῳ,
πληγεῖς ὑπ' ἔχεως, ἐλίπετ' ἐν Λήμνῳ νοσῶν. 5
Ἑλενος δ' Ἀχαιοῖς εἶφ' ἄλωσεσθ' Ἴλιον
τοῖς Ἡρακλέους τόξοισι παιδί τ' Ἀχιλλέως.
τά τόξ' ὑπῆρχε παρὰ Φιλοκτῆτη μόνῳ·
πεμφθεὶς δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀμφοτέρους συνήγαγεν.

1 Ἐν Χρύσει Ἀθηνᾶς ὦ: Χρύσης Ἀθηνᾶς Brunck: Ἐν χρύσει Ἀθηνᾶ Φ 3 πόθ'
Turnebus: τόθ' ὦ 4 ναυβάτην Τ στόλῳ Φ: στόλον ὦ 7 Ἡρακ-
λεῖοις Φ τόξοις Φ

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ
ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣ
ΧΟΡΟΣ
ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ
ΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΩΣ ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ
ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ

ἀκτὴ μὲν ἦδε τῆς περιρρύτου χθονὸς
 Λήμνου, βροτοῖς ἄστιπτος οὐδ' οἰκουμένη,
 ἔνθ', ὦ κρατίστου πατρός Ἑλλήνων τραφεῖς
 Ἀχιλλέως παῖ Νεοπτόλεμε, τὸν Μηλιᾶ
 Ποίαντος υἱὸν ἐξέθηκ' ἐγὼ ποτε, 5
 ταχθεῖς τόδ' ἔρδειν τῶν ἀνασσόντων ὕπο,
 νόσωι καταστάζοντα διαβόρωι πόδα·
 ὅτ' οὔτε λοιβῆς ἡμῖν οὔτε θυμάτων
 παρῆν ἐκῆλοις προσθιγεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀγρίαις
 κατέιχ' αἰεὶ πᾶν στρατόπεδον δυσφημίαις, 10
 βοῶν, στενάζων. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν τί δεῖ
 λέγειν; ἀκμὴ γὰρ οὐ μακρῶν ἡμῖν λόγων,
 μὴ καὶ μάθῃ μ' ἤκοντα κάκχέω τὸ πᾶν
 σόφισμα τῶι νιν αὐτίχ' αἰρήσειν δοκῶ.
 ἀλλ' ἔργον ἤδη σὸν τὰ λοῖφ' ὑπηρετεῖν, 15
 σκοπεῖν θ' ὅπου 'στ' ἐνταῦθα δίστομος πέτρα
 τοιάδ, ἴν' ἐν ψύχει μὲν ἡλίου διπλῇ
 πάρεστιν ἐνθάκησις, ἐν θέρει δ' ὕπνον
 δι' ἀμφιτρῆτος αὐλίου πέμπει πνοή,
 βαιὸν δ' ἐνερθεν ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς τάχ' ἄν 20
 ἴδοις ποτὸν κρηναῖον, εἴπερ ἐστὶ σῶν.
 ἅ μοι προσελθὼν σῖγα σήμαιν' εἴτ' ἔχει
 χῶρον τὸν αὐτὸν τόνδ' ἔτ', εἴτ' ἄλλῃ κυρεῖ,
 ὥς τάπίλοιπα τῶν λόγων σὺ μὲν κλύῃς,
 ἐγὼ δὲ φράζω, κοινὰ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἴηι. 25

ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣ

ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεῦ, τοῦργον οὐ μακρὰν λέγεις·
 δοκῶ γὰρ οἶον εἶπας ἄντρον εἰσορᾶν.
 Οδ. ἄνωθεν, ἢ κάτωθεν; οὐ γὰρ ἐννοῶ.

6 ὕπο ω: πάρα Φ 10 κατέιχ' Φ: κατείχετ' ω 11 στενάζων ω: ἰύζων Φ
 (cf. Tr. 787) 23 τὸν Blaydes: πρὸς ω τόνδ' ἔτ' Elmsley: τόνδε γ' Φ: τόνδ'
 ω 24 κλύῃς Φ: κλύοις ω 25 ἴηι Camerarius: εἴη ω 26 ὦναξ Φ

- Νε. τόδ' ἐξύπερθε, καὶ στίβου γ' οὐδεις κτύπος.
 Οδ. ὄρα καθ' ὕπνον μὴ καταυλισθεὶς κυρῆι. 30
 Νε. ὀρῶ κενὴν οἴκησιν ἀνθρώπων δίχα.
 Οδ. οὐδ' ἔνδον οἴκοποιός ἐστί τις τροφή;
 Νε. στιπτὴ γε φυλλὰς ὥς ἐναυλίζοντί τωι.
 Οδ. τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἔρημα, κούδεν ἐσθ' ὑπόστεγον;
 Νε. αὐτόξυλόν γ' ἔκπωμα, φλαουρουργοῦ τινος 35
 τεχνήματ' ἀνδρός, καὶ πυρεῖ' ὁμοῦ τάδε.
 Οδ. κείνου τὸ θησαύρισμα σημαίνεις τόδε.
 Νε. ἰοῦ ἰοῦ· καὶ ταῦτά γ' ἄλλα θάλπεται
 ῥάκη, βαρείας του νοσηλείας πλέα.
 Οδ. ἀνὴρ κατοικεῖ τούσδε τοὺς τόπους σαφῶς, 40
 κᾶστ' οὐχ ἑκάς που. πῶς γὰρ ἂν νοσῶν ἀνὴρ
 κῶλον παλαιαὶ κηρὶ προσβαίη μακράν;
 ἀλλ' ἢ 'πὶ φορβῆς νόστον ἐξεληλυθεν,
 ἢ φύλλον εἴ τι νώδυνον κάτοιδ' εἴ που.
 τὸν οὖν παρόντα πέμψον ἐς κατασκοπήν, 45
 μὴ καὶ λάθῃ με προσπεσών· ὥς μᾶλλον ἂν
 ἔλοιτό μ' ἢ τοὺς πάντας Ἀργεῖους λαβεῖν.
 Νε. ἀλλ' ἔρχεται τε καὶ φυλάσσεται στίβος.
 σὺ δ' εἴ τι χρήζεις, φράζε δευτέρωι λόγωι.
 Οδ. Ἀχιλλέως παῖ, δεῖ σ' ἐφ' οἷς ἐλήλυθας 50
 γενναῖον εἶναι, μὴ μόνον τῶι σώματι,
 ἀλλ' ἦν τι καινόν, ὦν πρὶν οὐκ ἀκήκοας,
 κλύης, ὑπουργεῖν, ὥς ὑπηρέτης πάρει.
 Νε. τί δῆτ' ἄνωγας; Οδ. τὴν Φιλοκτῆτου σε δεῖ 55
 ψυχὴν ὅπως λόγοισιν ἐκκλέψεις λέγων.
 ὅταν σ' ἐρωτᾷ τίς τε καὶ πόθεν πάρει,
 λέγειν, Ἀχιλλέως παῖς· τόδ' οὐχὶ κλεπτέον·
 πλεῖς δ' ὥς πρὸς οἶκον, ἐκλιπών τὸ ναυτικόν
 στράτευμ' Ἀχαιῶν, ἔχθος ἐχθήρας μέγα,
 οἱ σ' ἐν λιταῖς στείλαντες ἐξ οἴκων μολεῖν, 60
 μόνην ἔχοντες τήνδ' ἄλωσιν Ἰλίου,
 οὐκ ἤξιωσαν τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων
 ἐλθόντι δοῦναι κυρίως αἰτουμένωι,

29 γ' Φ: δ' Φ: τ' ω οὔδεις Bergk (with τύπος) τύπος Φ 30
 καταυλισθεὶς ω: κατακλιθεὶς Φ κυρεῖ Φ: κυρεῖς Φ 35 γ' ω: omitted
 Φ: τ' Φ φαυλουργοῦ Φ 40 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ω 47 ἔλοιτ' ἐμ'
 Buttmann λαβών Φ: μολεῖν Φ 55 ἐκκλέψεις Φ: ἐκκλέψης ω 60
 οἴκου Φ 61 μόνην Φ: μόνην δ' ω: μόνην γ' Seyffert τήν Φ

- ἀλλ' αὐτ' Ὀδυσσεῖ παρέδοσαν· λέγων ὅς' ἂν
 θέληις καθ' ἡμῶν ἔσχατ' ἔσχατων κακά.
 65 τοῦτ' οὐδέν μ' ἀλγυνεῖς· εἰ δ' ἐργάσῃ
 μὴ ταῦτα, λύπην πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις βαλεῖς.
 εἰ γὰρ τὰ τοῦδε τόξα μὴ ληφθήσεται,
 οὐκ ἔστι πέρσαι σοι τὸ Δαρδάνου πέδον.
 ὥς δ' ἔστ' ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐχί, σοὶ δ' ὁμιλία
 70 πρὸς τόνδε πιστὴ καὶ βέβαιος, ἔκμαθε·
 σὺ μὲν πέπλευκας οὔτ' ἔνορκος οὐδενὶ
 οὔτ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης οὔτε τοῦ πρώτου στόλου,
 ἐμοὶ δὲ τούτων οὐδέν ἔστ' ἀρνήσιμον·
 ὥστ' εἴ με τόξων ἐγκρατὴς αἰσθήσεται,
 75 ὀλωλα καὶ σὲ προσδιαφθερῶ ξυνών.
 ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο δεῖ σοφισθῆναι, κλοπεύς
 ὅπως γενήσῃ τῶν ἀνικῆτων ὀπλων.
 ἔξοιδα, παῖ, φύσει σε μὴ πεφυκότα
 τοιαῦτα φωνεῖν μηδὲ τεχνᾶσθαι κακά·
 80 ἀλλ' ἡδὺ γάρ τι κτῆμα τῆς νίκης λαβεῖν,
 τόλμα· δίκαιοι δ' αὖτις ἐκφανούμεθα.
 νῦν δ' εἰς ἀναιδὲς ἡμέρας μέρος βραχὺ
 δός μοι σεαυτόν, καίτα τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον
 κέκλησο πάντων εὐσεβέστατος βροτῶν.
 85 Νε. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖς ἂν τῶν λόγων ἀλγῶ κλύων,
 Λαερτίου παῖ, τούσδε καὶ πράσσειν στυγῶ·
 ἔφυν γὰρ οὐδέν ἐκ τέχνης πράσσειν κακῆς,
 οὔτ' αὐτὸς οὔθ', ὥς φασιν, οὐκφύσας ἐμέ.
 ἀλλ' εἴμ' ἔτοιμος πρὸς βίαν τὸν ἄνδρ' ἄγειν
 90 καὶ μὴ δόλοισιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἑνὸς ποδὸς
 ἡμᾶς τοσοῦσδε πρὸς βίαν χειρώσεται.
 πεμφθεὶς γε μέντοι σοὶ ξυνεργάτης ὀκνῶ
 προδότης καλεῖσθαι· βούλομαι δ', ἄναξ, καλῶς
 95 δρῶν ἐξαμαρτεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ νικᾶν κακῶς.
 Οδ. ἐσθλοῦ πατρὸς παῖ, καὶ τὸς ὦν νέος ποτὲ
 γλῶσσαν μὲν ἀργόν, χεῖρα δ' εἶχον ἐργάτιν·
 νῦν δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιὼν ὀρῶ βροτοῖς

66 τοῦτ' οὐδέν Buttman: τούτων ὦ μ' ἀλγυνεῖ Φ 73 after this line, one MS
 has ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ πόλις σώζει πόλιν. 79 παῖ Erfurd: καὶ ὦ 81 τοι
 Φ 82 θ' Φ: τ' Φ 83 εἰς ἀναιδούς Φ: -εἰς Φ 88 κακῶς Φ 97
 ἀργὴν Φ Β ἐργάτην Φ Β 98 βροτοῖς ὀρῶ Φ

	τὴν γλῶσσαν, οὐχὶ τάργα, πάνθ' ἡγουμένην.	
Νε.	τί οὖν μ' ἄνωγας ἄλλο πλὴν ψευδῇ λέγειν;	100
Οδ.	λέγω σ' ἐγὼ δόλωι Φιλοκτῆτην λαβεῖν.	
Νε.	τί δ' ἐν δόλωι δεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ πείσαντ' ἄγειν;	
Οδ.	οὐ μὴ πίθηται· πρὸς βίαν δ' οὐκ ἂν λάβοις.	
Νε.	οὕτως ἔχει τι δεινὸν ἰσχύος θράσος;	
Οδ.	ἰούς (γ') ἀφύκτους καὶ προπέμποντας φόνον.	105
Νε.	οὐκ ἄρ' ἐκείνῳ γ' οὐδὲ προσμεῖξαι θρασύ;	
Οδ.	οὐ, μὴ δόλωι λαβόντα γ', ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω.	
Νε.	οὐκ αἰσχρὸν ἡγήϊ δῆτα τὸ ψευδῇ λέγειν;	
Οδ.	οὐκ, εἰ τὸ σωθῆναι γε τὸ ψεῦδος φέρει.	
Νε.	πῶς οὖν βλέπων τις ταῦτα τολμήσει λακεῖν;	110
Οδ.	ὅταν τι δρᾷς εἰς κέρδος, οὐκ ὀκνεῖν πρέπει.	
Νε.	κέρδος δ' ἐμοὶ τί τοῦτον ἐς Τροίαν μολεῖν;	
Οδ.	αἰρεῖ τὰ τόξα ταῦτα τὴν Τροίαν μόνα.	
Νε.	οὐκ ἄρ' ὁ πέρσων, ὡς ἐφάσκετ', εἴμ' ἐγώ;	
Οδ.	οὐτ' ἂν σὺ κείνων χωρὶς οὐτ' ἐκεῖνα σοῦ.	115
Νε.	θηρατέ' οὖν γίγνοιτ' ἂν, εἴπερ ὧδ' ἔχει.	
Οδ.	ὡς τοῦτό γ' ἔρξας δύο φέρηι δωρήματα.	
Νε.	ποίω; μαθὼν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἄρνοιμην τὸ δρᾶν.	
Οδ.	σοφός τ' ἂν αὐτὸς κάγαθὸς κεκληῖ' ἅμα.	
Νε.	ἴτω· ποιήσω, πᾶσαν αἰσχύνην ἀφείς.	120
Οδ.	ἡ μνημονεύεις οὖν ἅ σοι παρήνευσα;	
Νε.	σάφ' ἴσθ', ἐπεῖπερ εἰσάπαξ συνήνευσα.	
Οδ.	σὺ μὲν μένων νυν κείνον ἐνθάδ' ἐκδέχου,	
	ἐγὼ δ' ἄπειμι, μὴ κατοπτευθῶ παρών,	
	καὶ τὸν σκοπὸν πρὸς ναῦν ἀποστελῶ πάλιν.	125
	καὶ δεῦρ', ἐάν μοι τοῦ χρόνου δοκῇ τέ τι	
	κατασχολάζειν, αὐτίς ἐκπέμψω πάλιν	
	τοῦτον τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα, ναυκληροῦ τρόποις	
	μορφὴν δολώσας, ὡς ἂν ἀγνοία προσῇ·	
	οὗ δῆτα, τέκνον, ποικίλως αὐδωμένου	130
	δέχου τὰ συμφέροντα τῶν ἀεὶ λόγων.	

100 οὖν μ' ὦ: μ' οὖν Wakefield 105 ἰούς (γ') Dobree 108 δῆτα τὸ
Vauvilliers (pr. Valckenaer): δῆ τάδε Φ: δῆτα τὰ ὦ 110 λακεῖν Φ: λαλεῖν ὦ: λαβεῖν
Φ 111 πρὸς Φ 112 δέ μοι Φ 114 πέρσων γ' Φ ἔφασκες Φ
116 θηρατέ' οὖν Τ: θηρατέ' ἂν Elmsley: θηρατέα ὦ: θηρατέα γοῦν Φ γένοιτ'
Φ 118 τὸ μὴ δρᾶν Φ 119 αὐτὸς Vauvilliers: αὐτὸς ὦ κεκληῖ' Φ: κέκληις'
Φ 123 νυν Φ: νῦν ὦ: omitted Φ ἐκείνον Φ 126 δοκῇ τέ τι Φ: δοκῇτ'
ἐτι ὦ 127 αὐτίς Φ 128 τρόπον Φ 129 ἀγνοία Φ

ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς ναῦν εἶμι, σοὶ παρεῖς τάδε·
 Ἑρμῆς δ' ὁ πέμπων δόλιος ἡγήσαιο νῶιν
 Νίκη τ' Ἀθάνα Πολιάς, ἥ σῶιζει μ' αἰεί.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

τί χρή, τί χρή με, δέσποτ', ἐν ξέναι ξένον [στρ. α
 στέγειν, ἢ τί λέγειν πρὸς ἄνδρ' ὑπόπταν; 136
 φράζε μοι.

τέχνα γὰρ τέχνας ἐτέρας
 προύχει καὶ γνώμα παρ' ὅτῳ τὸ θεῖον
 Διὸς σκῆπτρον ἀνάσσειται. 140
 σὲ δ', ὦ τέκνον, τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν
 πᾶν κράτος ὠγύγιον· τό μοι ἔννεπε
 τί σοι χρεῶν ὑπουργεῖν.

Νε. νῦν μὲν ἴσως γὰρ τόπον ἐσχατιαῖς
 προσιδεῖν ἐθέλεις ὄντινα κεῖται, 145
 δέρκου θαρσῶν· ὁπόταν δὲ μόλῃ
 δεινὸς ὀδίτης τῶνδ' οὐκ μελάθρων,
 πρὸς ἐμὴν αἰεὶ χεῖρα προχωρῶν
 πειρῶ τὸ παρὸν θεραπεύειν.

Χο. μέλον πάλαι μέλημά μοι λέγεις, ἄναξ, [ἀντ. α
 φρουρεῖν ὅμ' ἐπὶ σῶι μάλιστα καιρῶι· 151
 νῦν δέ μοι
 λέγ' αὐλὰς ποίας ἔνεδρος
 ναίει καὶ χῶρόν τίν' ἔχει. τὸ γὰρ μοι
 μαθεῖν οὐκ ἀποκαίριον, 155
 μὴ προσπεσῶν με λάθῃ ποθέν·
 τίς τόπος, ἢ τίς ἔδρα; τίν' ἔχει στίβον,
 ἔναυλον ἢ θυραῖον;

Νε. οἶκον μὲν ὀρᾷς τόνδ' ἀμφίθυρον
 πετρίνης κοίτης. 160

134 Ἀθάνα Φ B: Ἀθανᾶ ὦ 135 τί χρή twice ὦ, once Φ με δέσποτ' T:
 δέσποτά με ὦ: δέσποτ' Φ 139 γνώμα Φ: -ας Φ: γνώμα γνώμας Φ 141 σοὶ
 T, with ὦ omitted 142 τῶι Φ 144 γὰρ ἴσως Φ: ἴσως Φ ἐσχατιαῖς Φ
 147 οὐκ Linwood: ἐκ ὦ 150 ἄναξ ΦT: ἄναξ τὸ σὸν ὦ 153 αὐλᾶς Φ
 156 προσπεσῶν με λάθῃ Hermann: με λάθῃ προσπεσῶν ὦ 158 ἔναυλος ἢ
 θυραῖος Thomas Magister

- Χο. ποῦ γὰρ ὁ τλήμων αὐτὸς ἄπεστιν;
 Νε. δῆλον ἔμοιγ' ὥς φορβῆς χρεῖαι
 στίβον ὀγμεύει τῇιδε πέλας που.
 ταύτην γὰρ ἔχειν βιοτῆς αὐτὸν
 λόγος ἐστὶ φύσιν, θηροβολοῦντα
 πτηνοῖς ἰοῖς σμυγερόν σμυγερώς,
 οὐδέ τιν' αὐτῷ
 παιῶνα κακῶν ἐπινωμᾶν. 165
- Χο. οἰκτίρω νιν ἔγωγ', ὅπως, [στρ. β
 μὴ του κηδομένου βροτῶν 170
 μηδὲ σύντροφον ὄμμ' ἔχων,
 δύστανος, μόνος αἰεί,
 νοσεῖ μὲν νόσον ἀγρίαν,
 ἀλύει δ' ἐπὶ παντὶ τῷ
 χρεῖας ἵσταμένωι. πῶς ποτε, πῶς δύσμορος ἀντέχει; 175-6
 ὦ παλάμαι θνητῶν,
 ὦ δύσтана γένη βροτῶν
 οἷς μὴ μέτριος αἰών.
- οὔτος πρωτογόνων ἴσως [ἀντ. β
 οἰκων οὐδενὸς ὕστερος 181
 πάντων ἄμμορος ἐν βίῳι
 κεῖται μούνος ἀπ' ἄλλων
 στικτῶν ἢ λασίων μετὰ
 θηρῶν, ἐν τ' ὀδύναις ὁμοῦ 185
 λιμῷ τ' οἰκτρὸς ἀνήκεστ' ἀμερίμνητά τ' ἔχων βάρη.
 ἃ δ' ἀθυρόστομος
 Ἄχῳ τηλεφανῆς πικραῖς
 οἰμωγαῖς ὑπακούει. 190
- Νε. οὐδὲν τούτων θαυμαστὸν ἐμοί·
 θεῖα γάρ, εἴπερ κάγῳ τι φρονῶ,
 καὶ τὰ παθήματα κεῖνα πρὸς αὐτὸν

161 τλάμων Φ 163 τῇιδε Blaydes: τήνδε ΦΒ: τόνδε Ω: τώνδε Φ 166
 σμυγερόν σμυγερώς Σ, Brunck: στυγερόν στυγερώς Ω 167 αὐ- Φ 171
 μηδὲ Φ: μηδ' αὖ Τ: μὴ Ω 172 αἰεί Τ: αἰεί Ω 177 θεῶν Lachmann
 181 ἦκων Β 186-7 ἀνήκεστ' ἀμερίμνηματά τ' Page: ἀνήκεστα μερίμνηματ' Ω
 186-8 βάρη, ἃ δ' Hermann: βαρέια δ' Ω 189-90 πικραῖς οἰμωγαῖς Brunck:
 -ᾶς... ᾶς Ω 190 ὑπακούει Auratus: ὑπόκειται Ω 193 παθήματα κείνα
 Brunck: παθήματ' ἐκεῖνα Ω

τῆς ὠμόφρονος Χρύσης ἐπέβη,
καὶ νῦν ἄ πονεῖ δίχα κηδεμόνων,
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὥς οὐ θεῶν του μελέτηι
τοῦ μὴ πρότερον τόνδ' ἐπὶ Τροίαι
τεῖναι τὰ θεῶν ἀμάχητα βέλη,
πρὶν ὅδ' ἐξήκοι χρόνος, ὧι λέγεται
χρῆναί σφ' ὑπὸ τῶνδε δαμῆναι. 200

Χο. εὖστομ' ἔχε, παῖ. Νε. τί τόδε; Χο. προῦφάνη κτύπος, [στρ γ
φωτὸς σύντροφος ὡς τειρομένου (του),
ἣ που ταῖδ' ἦ ταῖδε τόπων.
βάλλει, βάλλει μ' ἐτύμα 205
φθογγὰ του στίβου κατ' ἀνάγ-
καν ἔρποντος, οὐδέ με λά-
θει βαρεῖα τηλόθεν αὐ-
δὰ τρυσάνωρ· διάσημα γάρ θρηνεῖ.

ἀλλ' ἔχε, τέκνον— Νε. λέγ' ὅτι. Χο. φροντίδας νέας· [ἀντ. γ
ὡς οὐκ ἔξεδρος, ἀλλ' ἔντοπος ἀνὴρ, 212
οὐ μολπὰν σύριγγος ἔχων,
ὡς ποιμήν ἀγροβάτας,
ἀλλ' ἦ που πταίων ὑπ' ἀνάγ- 215
κας βοᾷ τηλωπὸν ἰω-
άν, ἦ ναὸς ἄξενον αὐ-
γάζων ὄρμον· προβοᾷ τι γὰρ δεινόν.

ΦΙΛΟΚΤΗΤΗΣ

ἰὼ ξένοι·
τίνες ποτ' ἐς γῆν τήνδε ναυτίλῳι πλάτῃ 220
κατέσχετ' οὐτ' εὖορμον οὐτ' οἰκουμένην;
ποίας πάτρας ἂν ἦ γένους ὑμᾶς ποτε
τύχοιμ' ἂν εἰπών; σχῆμα μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλάδος

196 ἔσθ' ὡς Porson: ἔσθ' ὅπως ὦ: ἔστιν ὅπως T (omitting του) 197 Τροίαις Φ:
-αν Φ 199 ἐξήκοι Φ: ἐξήκει ΦT: ἐξήκοιτο Φ: ἐξήκει Schaefer 200 χρῆναί
ΦT: χρήν Φ: χρήν Φ 203 (του) Porson 204 assigned to Ch. by Hermann:
assigned to Ne. by ὦ ταῖδ'... ταῖδε Blaydes: τηδ'... τηδε ὦ 205 ἐτύμα
ΦT: ἐτοίμα ὦ 206 του Φ: τοῦ ὦ στίβου ΦT 207-8 λάθει ΦT:
λήθει ὦ 209 γὰρ θρηνεῖ Dindorf: γὰρ θροεῖ ὦ: θροεῖ γάρ T (cf. 218) 212
ἀνὴρ eds: ἄ- ὦ 213 μολπὰς T 214 ἀγροβάτας ΦT 216 τηλωπὰν
Φ 218 τι γὰρ Wunder: γάρ τι ὦ (cf. 209) 220 ναυτίλῳι πλάτῃ Φ: κάκ
ποίας πάτρας ὦ 222 ἂν ἦ γένους ὑμᾶς T: ἂν ὑμᾶς ἦ γένους ὦ: ὑμᾶς ἂν ἦ γένους
Φ

- στολῆς ὑπάρχει προσφιλεστάτης ἐμοί·
 φωνῆς δ' ἀκοῦσαι βούλομαι· καὶ μὴ μ' ὄκνωι 225
 δείσαντες ἐκπλαγῆτ' ἀπηγριωμένον,
 ἀλλ' οἰκτίσαντες ἄνδρα δύστηνον, μόνον,
 ἔρημον ὧδε κἀφίλον κακούμενον,
 φωνήσατ', εἴπερ ὥς φίλοι προσήκετε.
 ἀλλ' ἀνταμείψασθ'· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὸς οὗτ' ἐμὲ 230
 ὑμῶν ἀμαρτεῖν τοῦτό γ' οὕθ' ὑμᾶς ἐμοῦ.
- Νε. ἀλλ', ὦ ξέν', ἴσθι τοῦτο πρῶτον, οὐνεκα
 Ἑλληνές ἐσμεν· τοῦτο γὰρ βούληι μαθεῖν.
- Φι. ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα· φεῦ τὸ καὶ λαβεῖν
 πρόσφθεγμα τοιοῦθ' ἄνδρὸς ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ. 235
 τίς σ', ὦ τέκνον, προσέσχε, τίς προσήγαγεν
 χρεῖα; τίς ὁρμή; τίς ἀνέμων ὁ φίλτατος;
 γέγωνέ μοι πᾶν τοῦθ', ὅπως εἰδῶ τίς εἶ.
- Νε. ἐγὼ γένος μὲν εἰμι τῆς περιρρύτου
 Σκύρου· πλέω δ' ἐς οἶκον· αὐδῶμαι δὲ παῖς 240
 Ἀχιλλέως, Νεοπτόλεμος. οἶσθ' ἤδη τὸ πᾶν.
- Φι. ὦ φιλτάτου παῖ πατρός, ὦ φίλης χθονός,
 ὦ τοῦ γέροντος θρέμμα Λυκομήδους, τίني
 στόλῳ προσέσχες τήνδε γῆν; πόθεν πλέων;
- Νε. ἐξ Ἰλίου τοι δὴ τανῦν γε ναυστολῶ. 245
- Φι. πῶς εἶπας; οὐ γὰρ δὴ σύ γ' ἦσθα ναυβάτης
 ἡμῖν κατ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ πρὸς Ἴλιον στόλου.
- Νε. ἦ γὰρ μετέσχες καὶ σὺ τοῦδε τοῦ πόνου;
- Φι. ὦ τέκνον, οὐ γὰρ οἶσθά μ' ὄντιν' εἰσοραῖς·
- Νε. πῶς γὰρ κάτοιδ' ὄν γ' εἶδον οὐδεπώποτε; 250
- Φι. οὐδ' ὄνομ' (ἄρ') οὐδὲ τῶν ἐμῶν κακῶν κλέος
 ἦισθου ποτ' οὐδέν, οἷς ἐγὼ διωλλύμην;
- Νε. ὥς μηδὲν εἰδότη' ἴσθι μ' ὦν ἀνιστορεῖς.
- Φι. ὦ πόλλ' ἐγὼ μοχθηρός, ὦ πικρὸς θεοῖς,
 οὐ μηδὲ κληδὼν ὧδ' ἔχοντος οἴκαδε 255
 μηδ' Ἑλλάδος γῆς μηδαμοῦ διῆλθέ πω·
 ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐκβαλόντες ἀνοσίως ἐμὲ
 γελῶσι σῖγ' ἔχοντες, ἡ δ' ἐμὴ νόσος

227 δύσμορον Φ 228 κακούμενον Brunck (pr. Valckenaer): καλούμενον Ω
 229 προσήκατε Φ 230 ἀνταμείβεσθ' Φ 237 ἀνέμων ΦΒ: δ' ἀνέμων ΩΒ
 241 οἶσθα δὴ Φ 244 πλέων πόθεν Φ 245 δὴ τανῦν Buttman: δῆτα
 νῦν Ω 249 μ' ὡ: γ' Φ: δ' Φ 251 ὄνομ' ἄρ' Erfurd: οὔνομ' ΦΤ: ὄνομα Ω
 κλέος κακῶν Φ: φήμην κακῶν Φ 252 ἐγὼ Ω: κακῶς Φ 253 ἀν ἰστορεῖς Φ:
 ἀν ἰστορῆς οἱ -ῆις Φ: ἰστορῆς Φ 256 μήθ' Φ πω Φ: πῶν Ω

ἄει τέθηλε κάπῃ μεῖζον ἔρχεται.

ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ πατρός ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως,

ὀδ' εἴμ' ἐγὼ σοι κείνος, δν κλύεις ἴσως

τῶν Ἡρακλείων ὄντα δεσπότην δπλων,

ὁ τοῦ Ποίαντος παῖς Φιλοκτήτης, δν οἱ

δισσοὶ στρατηγοὶ χῶ Κεφαλλήνων ἄναξ

ἔρριψαν αἰσχροῦς ὦδ' ἔρημον, ἀγρίαι

νόσῳ καταφθίνοντα, τῆς ἀνδροφθόρου

πληγέντ' ἐχίδνης ἀγρίῳ χαράγματι·

ξύν ἤι μ' ἐκείνοι, παῖ, προθέντες ἐνθάδε

ῶιχοντ' ἔρημον, ἡνίκ' ἐκ τῆς ποντίας

Χρύσης κατέσχον δεῦρο ναυβάτηι στόλῳ.

τότ' ἄσμενοί μ' ὥς εἶδον ἐκ πολλοῦ σάλου

εὐδοντ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς ἐν κατηρεφεῖ πέτραι,

λιπόντες ῶιχονθ', οἷα φωτὶ δυσμόρῳι

ράκη προθέντες βαιὰ καὶ τι καὶ βορᾶς

ἐπωφέλημα σμικρόν, οἳ αὐτοῖς τύχοι.

σὺ δῆ, τέκνον, ποίαν μ' ἀνάστασιν δοκεῖς

αὐτῶν βεβώτων ἐξ ὕπνου στήναι τότε;

ποῖ' ἐκδακρῦσαι, ποῖ' ἀποιμῶξαι κακά;

ὀρῶντα μὲν ναῦς, ἅς ἔχων ἐναυστόλουν,

πάσας βεβώσας, ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' ἔντοπον,

οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, οὐδ' ὅστις νόσου

κάμνοντι συλλάβοιτο· πάντα δὲ σκοπῶν

ἡῦρισκον οὐδέν πλὴν ἀνιάσθαι παρόν,

τούτου δὲ πολλὴν εὐμάρειαν, ὦ τέκνον.

ὁ μὲν χρόνος δὴ διὰ χρόνου προὔβαινέ μοι,

κάδει τι βαιᾷ τῇιδ' ὑπὸ στέγῃ μόνον

διακονεῖσθαι· γαστρὶ μὲν τὰ σύμφορα

τόξον τόδ' ἐξηύρισκε, τὰς ὑποπτέρους

βάλλον πελείας· πρὸς δὲ τοῦθ', ὃ μοι βάλοι

νευροσπαδῆς ἄτρακτος, αὐτὸς ἂν τάλας

εἰλυόμην, δύστηνον ἐξέλκων πόδα,

πρὸς τοῦτ' ἄν· εἴ τ' ἔδει τι καὶ ποτὸν λαβεῖν

καὶ που πάγου χυθέντος, οἷα χεῖματι,

260 οὐξ ΦΤ 266 τῆς Φ: τῆςδ' ὦ 267 ἀγρίῳ ὦ: φοινίῳ Β 272
 πέτραι Φ: πέτρῳι ὦ 278 ποῖα μ' οἰμῶξαι ΦΤ 281 νόσον Φ: -οι Φ
 282 συμβάλ(λ)οιτο Φ 285 δῆ Φ: οὖν ὦ: νυν Wecklein 286 verse omitted
 Φ βαιᾷ Φ: βαιῇ ὦ 288 ἐξηύρισκε: eds.: ἐξεύρισκε Φ: εὗρισκε ὦ 289
 βάλοι ὦ: βάλλον Τ 291 δύστηνον Canter: -ος ὦ ΒΣ

- ξύλον τι θραῦσαι, ταῦτ' ἄν ἐξέρπων τάλας
 ἔμηχανώμην· εἴτα πῦρ ἄν οὐ παρῇν, 295
 ἄλλ' ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον ἐκτρίβων μόλις
 ἔφην' ἄφαντον φῶς, ὃ καὶ σῶζει μ' αἰεί.
 οἰκουμένη γὰρ οὖν στέγη πυρὸς μέτα
 πάντ' ἐκπορίζει πλὴν τὸ μὴ νοσεῖν ἐμέ.
 φέρ', ὦ τέκνον, νῦν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθητις. 300
 ταύτῃ πελάζει ναυβάτης οὐδεις ἐκών·
 οὐ γάρ τις ὄρμος ἔστιν, οὐδ' ὅποι πλέων
 ἐξεμπολήσει κέρδος, ἢ ξενώσεται.
 οὐκ ἐνθάδ' οἱ πλοῖ τοῖσι σώφροσιν βροτῶν.
 τάχ' οὖν τις ἄκων ἔσχε· πολλὰ γὰρ τάδε 305
 ἐν τῷ μακρῷ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀνθρώπων χρόνῳ·
 οὐτοί μ', ὅταν μόλωσιν, ὦ τέκνον, λόγοις
 ἔλεοῦσι μέν, καὶ πού τι καὶ βορᾶς μέρος
 προσέδοσαν οἰκτίραντες, ἢ τινα στολήν·
 ἐκείνο δ' οὐδεὶς, ἡνίκ' ἂν μνησθῶ, θέλει, 310
 σῶσαί μ' ἐς οἴκους, ἀλλ' ἀπόλλυμαι τάλας
 ἔτος τόδ' ἤδη δέκατον ἐν λιμῷ τε καὶ
 κακοῖσι βόσκων τὴν ἀδηφάγον νόσον.
 τοιαῦτ' Ἀτρεΐδαι μ' ἢ τ' Ὀδυσσέως βία,
 ὦ παῖ, δεδράκασ'· οἷς Ὀλύμπιοι θεοὶ 315
 δοῖέν ποτ' αὐτοῖς ἀντίποιν' ἐμοῦ παθεῖν.
- Χο. ἔοικα κἀγὼ τοῖς ἀφιγμένοις ἴσα
 ξένοις ἐποικτίρειν σε, Ποίαντος τέκνον.
- Νε. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸς τοῖσδε μάρτυς ἐν λόγοις,
 ὡς εἶσ' ἀληθεῖς οἶδα, σὺν τυχῶν κακῶν 320
 ἀνδρῶν Ἀτρειδῶν τῆς τ' Ὀδυσσέως βίας.
- Φι. ἦ γάρ τι καὶ σὺ τοῖς πανωλέθοις ἔχεις
 ἔγκλημ' Ἀτρεΐδαις, ὥστε θυμοῦσθαι παθών;
- Νε. θυμὸν γένοιτο χειρὶ πληρῶσαί ποτε,
 ἴν' αἱ Μυκῆναι γνοῖεν ἢ Σπάρτη θ' ὅτι 325
 χῆ Σκυῖρος ἀνδρῶν ἀλκίμων μῆτηρ ἔφν.
- Φι. εὖ γ', ὦ τέκνον· τίνος γὰρ ὦδε τὸν μέγαν
 χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλῶν ἐλήλυθας;

294 ξύλων Φ τάλας Ω: τάχα Φ 296 ἐκτρίβων Φ 297 φῶς Ω:
 πῦρ ΦΒ 300 μάθοις Φ: μάθε Φ 305 οὖν Ω: ἂν Hermann 306
 ἀνθρώπῳ Φ 315 οἱ Porson 316 ἀντίποιν' Φ: ἀντάποιν' Ω 319
 λόγοι Φ 320 σὺν τυχῶν Paley: συντυχῶν Ω: γὰρ τυχῶν Φ 324
 θυμὸν... χεῖρι Lambinus: θυμῷ... χεῖρα Ω

- Νε ὦ παῖ Ποιάντος, ἔξερῶ, μόλις δ' ἔρῶ,
 ἄγωγ' ὕπ' αὐτῶν ἐξελωβήθην μολῶν. 330
 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔσχε μοῖρ' Ἀχιλλέα θανεῖν –
- Φι. οἴμοι· φράσηις μοι μὴ πέρα, πρὶν ἂν μάθω
 πρῶτον τόδ'· ἥ τέθνηκ' ὁ Πηλέως γόνος;
- Νε. τέθνηκεν, ἀνδρὸς οὐδενός, θεοῦ δ' ὕπο,
 τοξευτός, ὡς λέγουσιν, ἐκ Φοίβου δαμείς. 335
- Φι. ἀλλ' εὐγενής μὲν ὁ κτανῶν τε χῶ θανῶν.
 ἀμηχανῶ δὲ πότερον, ὦ τέκνον, τὸ σὸν
 πάθημ' ἐλέγχω πρῶτον, ἢ κείνον στένω.
- Νε. οἴμαι μὲν ἀρκεῖν σοί γε καὶ τὰ σ', ὦ τάλας,
 ἀλγήμαθ', ὥστε μὴ τὰ τῶν πέλας στένειν. 340
- Φι. ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας. τοιγαροῦν τὸ σὸν φράσον
 αὖθις πάλιν μοι πράγμ', ὅττωι σ' ἐνύβρισαν.
- Νε. ἦλθόν με νηῖ ποικιλοστόλῳ μέτα
 δῖός τ' Ὀδυσσεὺς χῶ τροφεὺς τοῦμοῦ πατρός,
 λέγοντες, εἴτ' ἀληθὲς εἴτ' ἄρ' οὖν μάτην, 345
 ὡς οὐ θέμις γίγνοιτ', ἐπεὶ κατέφθιτο
 πατὴρ ἐμός, τὰ πέργαμ' ἄλλον ἢ μ' ἐλεῖν.
 ταῦτ', ὦ ξέν', οὕτως ἐννέποντες οὐ πολὺν
 χρόνον μ' ἐπέσχον μὴ με ναυστολεῖν ταχύ,
 μάλιστα μὲν δὴ τοῦ θανόντος ἰμέρῳ, 350
 ὅπως ἴδοιμ' ἄθαπτον· οὐ γὰρ εἰδόμην·
 ἔπειτα μέντοι χῶ λόγος καλὸς προσῆν,
 εἰ τὰπὶ Τροίαι πέργαμ' αἰρήσοιμ' ἰών.
 ἦν δ' ἡμαρ ἤδη δεύτερον πλέοντί μοι,
 κάγῳ πικρὸν Σίγειον οὐρίῳ πλάττη 355
 κατηγόμην· καί μ' εὐθὺς ἐν κύκλῳ στρατός
 ἐκβάντα πᾶς ἡσπάζετ', ὁμνύντες βλέπειν
 τὸν οὐκέτ' ὄντα ζῶντ' Ἀχιλλέα πάλιν.
 κείνος μὲν οὖν ἔκειτ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὁ δύσμορος,
 ἐπεὶ δάκρυσα κείνον, οὐ μακρῶι χρόνῳι 360
 ἐλθὼν Ἀτρείδας προσφιλῶς, ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν,
 τὰ θ' ὁπλ' ἀπήιτουν τοῦ πατρός τὰ τ' ἄλλ' ὅσ' ἦν.
 οἱ δ' εἶπον, οἴμοι, τλημονέστατον λόγον,

331 παθεῖν Φ 333 εἰ Φ 342 ὅπως Φ 343 ποικιλοστόμῳ Φ
 344 τροφός Φ 347 ἡ μ' Φ: ἡ μ' ὦ 349 ἐπασχον Φ τάχα Φ
 360 δάκρυσα ΦΤ: δάκρυσα ὦ 361 προσφιλῶς Φ: πρὸς φίλῳς Φ: προσφιλής
 Φ: πρὸς φίλῳς ὦ

“ὦ σπέρμ’ Ἀχιλλέως, τᾶλλα μὲν πάρεστί σοι
 πατρῷι’ ἐλέσθαι, τῶν δ’ ὀπλων κείνων ἀνήρ
 ἄλλος κρατύνει νῦν, ὁ Λαέρτου γόνος.” 365
 κἀγὼ ἔδακρύσας εὐθύς ἐξανίσταμαι
 ὀργῇ βαρεῖαι, καὶ καταλήσας λέγω·
 “ὦ σχέτλι’, ἧ ἵτολήμασ’ ἀντ’ ἐμοῦ τινι
 δοῦναι τὰ τεύχη τάμα, πρὶν μαθεῖν ἐμοῦ;” 370
 ὁ δ’ εἶπ’ Ὀδυσσεύς, πλησίον γὰρ ὦν κύρει,
 “ναί, παῖ, δεδώκας ἐνδίκως οὔτοι τάδε·
 ἐγὼ γὰρ αὖτ’ ἔσωσα κάκεινον παρών.”
 κἀγὼ χολωθείς εὐθύς ἤρασσον κακοῖς
 τοῖς πᾶσιν, οὐδὲν ἐνδεὲς ποιούμενος, 375
 εἰ τάμα κείνος ὀπλ’ ἀφαιρήσοιτό με.
 ὁ δ’ ἐνθάδ’ ἦκων, καίπερ οὐ δύσσοργος ὦν,
 δηχθεὶς πρὸς ἀξήκουσεν ὧδ’ ἡμείψατο·
 “οὐκ ἦσθ’ ἴν’ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀπῆσθ’ ἴν’ οὐ σ’ ἔδει·
 καὶ ταῦτ’, ἐπειδὴ καὶ λέγεις θρασυστομῶν, 380
 οὐ μή ποτ’ ἐς τὴν Σκυῖρον ἐκπλεύσης ἔχων.”
 τοιαῦτ’ ἀκούσας κάξονειδισθεὶς κακὰ
 πλέω πρὸς οἴκους, τῶν ἐμῶν τητῶμενος
 πρὸς τοῦ κακίστου κακὸν κακῶν Ὀδυσσέως.
 κοῦκ αἰτιῶμαι κείνον ὥς τοὺς ἐν τέλει· 385
 πόλις γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα τῶν ἡγουμένων
 στρατός τε σύμπας· οἱ δ’ ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν
 διδασκάλων λόγοισι γίγνονται κακοί.
 λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς· ὁ δ’ Ἀτρεΐδας στυγῶν
 ἐμοί θ’ ὁμοίως καὶ θεοῖς εἴη φίλος. 390

Χο. ὀρεστέρα παμβῶτι Γᾶ, 395
 μᾶτερ αὐτοῦ Διός,
 ἃ τὸν μέγαν Πακτωλὸν εὗχρυσον νέμεις,
 σὲ κάκεῖ, μᾶτερ πότνι’, ἐπηυδῶμαν, 395
 ὅτ’ ἐς τόνδ’ Ἀτρεΐδαν
 ὕβρις πᾶσ’ ἐχώρει,
 ὅτε τὰ πάτρια τεύχεα παρεδίδοσαν,

366 Λαρτίου Φ 367 ἔδακρύσας Φ: δακρύσας ὠ 369 ἧ ὠ: οἱ Φ 371
 κυρεῖ Porson (pr. Markland) 376 μου Φ 385–8 deleted by Reeve, 386–8
 by Fraenkel 388 τρόποισι 395 ἐξηυδῶμαν T 399 παραδίδοσαν

ἰὼ μάκαιρα ταυροκτόνων

400

λεόντων ἔφεδρε, τῷ Λαρτίου,

σέβας ὑπέρτατον.

- Φι. ἔχοντες, ὡς ἔοικε, σύμβολον σαφές
λύπης πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὦ ξένοι, πεπλευκάτε,
καί μοι προσάιδεθ' ὥστε γιγνώσκειν ὅτι 405
ταῦτ' ἐξ Ἀτρειδῶν ἔργα κᾶξ Ὀδυσσέως.
ἔξοιδα γάρ νιν παντὸς ἂν λόγου κακοῦ
γλώσσηι θιγόντα καὶ πανουργίας, ἀφ' ἧς
μηδὲν δίκαιον ἐς τέλος μέλλοι ποεῖν.
ἀλλ' οὐ τι τοῦτο θαῦμ' ἔμοιγ', ἀλλ' εἰ παρῶν 410
Αἴας ὁ μείζων ταῦθ' ὀρῶν ἠνείχετο.
- Νε. οὐκ ἦν ἔτι ζῶν, ὦ ξέν'. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε
ζῶντός γ' ἐκείνου ταῦτ' ἐσυλήθην ἐγώ.
- Φι. πῶς εἴπας; ἀλλ' ἦ χοῦτος οἵχεται θανῶν;
Νε. ὡς μηκέτ' ὄντα κείνον ἐν φάει νόει. 415
- Φι. οἴμοι τάλας. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Τυδέως γόνος,
οὐδ' οὐμπολητὸς Σισύφου Λαερτίωι,
οὐ μὴ θάνωσι. τούσδε γὰρ μὴ ζῆν ἔδει.
- Νε. οὐ δῆτ' ἐπίστω τοῦτό γ'. ἀλλὰ καὶ μέγα
θάλλοντές εἰσι νῦν ἐν Ἀργείων στρατῶι. 420
- Φι. τί δ' αὖ παλαιὸς κάγαθός φίλος τ' ἐμός,
Νέστωρ ὁ Πύλιος, ἔστιν; οὗτος γὰρ τά γε
κείνων κάκ' ἐξήρυκε, βουλευῶν σοφά.
- Νε. κείνός γε πράσσει νῦν κακῶς, ἐπεὶ θανῶν
Ἀντίλοχος αὐτῷ φροῦδος δς παρῆν γόνος. 425
- Φι. οἴμοι, δὴ αὖ τῶδ' ἄνδρ' ἔλεξας, οἷν ἐγὼ
ἦκιστ' ἂν ἠθέλησ' ὀλωλότοιν κλύειν.
φεῦ φεῦ· τί δῆτα δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ὅθ' οἶδε μὲν
τεθνᾶσ', Ὀδυσσεὺς δ' ἔστιν αὖ κἀνταῦθ' ἵνα
χρῆν ἀντὶ τούτων αὐτὸν αὐδοῖσθαι νεκρόν; 430
- Νε. σοφὸς παλαιστῆς κείνος, ἀλλὰ χαί σοφαί

401 Λαρτίου Φ: Λαερ- ὦ 405 προσάιδεσθ' Φ 409 μέλλοι Φ: μέλοι Φ:
μέλλει: ὦ 414 ἀλλ' omitted Φ 417 Λαερτίωι Φ: Λαερτίου ὦ 420
Ἀργείων Φ: Ἀργείωι ὦ 421 αὖ Hermann: ὁ ὦ: ὦ Φ: ὦ Φ: δς Φ 422
τάχα Φ: τάχ' ἂν Hermann 423 τάδ' ἐξήρυκε Φ καξεκλήρυξεν Φ κάκ'
ἐξήρυξε Hermann σοφά Φ: σοφῶς Φ: σαφῶς Φ 424 πράσσειν ἦν Φ
425 δς παρῆν Tour: δσπερ ἦν ὦ μόνος ΦΣ 426 αὖ τῶδ' Porson: αὐτως
ὦ: αὐτῷ δ' Σ ἄνδρ' ἔλεξας Jebb, Blaydes: δεῖν' ἔλεξας ὦ: ἐξέδειξας Σ

- γνώμαι, Φιλοκτῆτ', ἐμποδίζονται θαμά.
- Φι. φέρ' εἰπὲ πρὸς θεῶν, ποῦ γὰρ ἦν ἐνταῦθά σοι
Πάτροκλος, ὃς σοῦ πατὴρ ἦν τὰ φίλτατα;
- Νε. χοῦτος τεθνηκώς ἦν· λόγῳ δέ σ' ἐ(ν) βραχεῖ 435
τοῦτ' ἐκιδάξω· πόλεμος οὐδέν' ἄνδρ' ἐκὼν
αἰρεῖ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἀεί.
- Φι. ξυμμαρτυρῶ σοι· καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτό γε
ἀναξίου μὲν φωτὸς ἐξερήσομαι,
γλώσσει δὲ δεινοῦ καὶ σοφοῦ, τί νῦν κυρεῖ. 440
- Νε. ποίου δὲ τούτου πλήν γ' Ὀδυσσεώς ἐρεῖς;
- Φι. οὐ τοῦτον εἶπον, ἀλλὰ Θερσίτης τις ἦν,
ὃς οὐκ ἂν εἶλετ' εἰσάπαξ εἰπεῖν, ὅπου
μηδεὶς ἐώη· τοῦτον οἶσθ' εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ;
- Νε. οὐκ εἶδον αὐτόν, ἥισθόμην δ' ἔτ' ὄντα νιν. 445
- Φι. ἔμελλ'· ἐπεὶ οὐδέν πω κακόν γ' ἀπώλετο,
ἀλλ' εὖ περιστέλλουσιν αὐτὰ δαίμονες,
καὶ πῶς τὰ μὲν πανοῦργα καὶ παλιντριβῆ
χαίρουσ' ἀναστρέφοντες ἐξ Αἰδου, τὰ δὲ
δίκαια καὶ τὰ χρήστ' ἀποστέλλουσ' ἀεί. 450
ποῦ χρή τίθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν, ὅταν
τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν τοὺς θεοὺς εὖρω κακοὺς;
- Νε. ἐγὼ μὲν, ὦ γένεθλον Οἰταίου πατρός,
τὸ λοιπὸν ἤδη τηλόθεν τό τ' Ἴλιον
καὶ τοὺς Ἀτρεΐδας εἰσορῶν φυλάξομαι· 455
ὅπου δ' ὁ χεῖρων τάγαθοῦ μείζον σθένει
κάποφθίνει τὰ χρηστὰ χῶ δεινὸς κρατεῖ,
τούτους ἐγὼ τοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ στέρξω ποτέ·
ἀλλ' ἡ πετραία Σκυῖρος ἐξαρκούσά μοι
ἔσται τὸ λοιπόν, ὥστε τέρπεσθαι δόμῳ. 460
νῦν δ' εἴμι πρὸς ναῦν. καὶ σύ, Ποιάντος τέκνον,
χαῖρ' ὥς μέγιστα, χαῖρε· καὶ σε δαίμονες
νόσου μεταστήσειαν, ὥς αὐτὸς θέλεις.
ἡμεῖς δ' ἴωμεν, ὥς ὀπήνικ' ἂν θεὸς
πλοῦν ἡμῖν εἴκηι, τηνικαῦθ' ὀρμώμεθα. 465
- Φι. ἤδη, τέκνον, στέλλεσθε; Νε. καιρὸς γὰρ καλεῖ

434 σοῦ Hemsterhuys: σοι ὦ 435 σ' ἐ(ν) Erfurdt: σε ὦ 437 αἰρεῖ ΦB:
αἶρει Φ: αἶρει ὦ 441 δὲ Φ: γε Φ: τε ὦ 444 ἐκὼν Φ: ἐκὼν Φ
446 ἐπεὶ γ' Φ οὐδέν πω Φ: οὐδέπω ὦ 455 εἰσορᾶν Φ 456 δ' Hermann:
θ' Φ: τοι Φ: γ' ὦ 457 δειλὸς Brunck 459 πατρώια Φ 460 μόνῳ
B 465 ἡκη Φ: ἡκει Φ

- πλοῦν μὴ ᾽ξ ἀπόπτου μᾶλλον ἢ ᾽γγύθεν σκοπεῖν.
 Φι. πρὸς νῦν σε πατρός, πρὸς τε μητρός, ὦ τέκνον,
 πρὸς τ' εἴ τί σοι κατ' οἶκόν ἐστι προσφιλές,
 ἰκέτης ἱκνουῦμαι, μὴ λίπηις μ' οὕτω μόνον, 470
 ἔρημον ἐν κακοῖσι τοῖσδ' οἷοις ὁραῖς
 ὅσοισί τ' ἐξήκουσας ἐνναίοντά με.
 ἀλλ' ἐν παρέργωι θεοῦ με. δυσχέρεια μέν,
 ἔξοιδα, πολλή τοῦδε τοῦ φορήματος·
 ὁμῶς δὲ τλῆθι· τοῖσι γενναίοισί τοι 475
 τό τ' αἰσχρὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν εὐκλεές.
 σοὶ δ', ἐκλιπόντι τοῦτ', ὄνειδος οὐ καλόν,
 δράσαντι δ', ὦ παῖ, πλεῖστον εὐκλείας γέρας,
 ἐὰν μόλω ᾽γὼ ζῶν πρὸς Οἰταίαν χθόνα.
 ἴθ', ἡμέρας τοι μόχθος οὐχ ὀλης μιᾶς. 480
 τόλμησον, ἐμβαλοῦ μ' ὅποι θέλεις ἄγων,
 ἐς ἀντλίαν, ἐς πρῶιραν, ἐς πρύμνην, ὅποι
 ἦκιστα μέλλω τοὺς ξυνόντας ἀλγυνεῖν.
 νεῦσον, πρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζηνὸς ἱκεσίου, τέκνον,
 πείσθητι. προσπίτνω σε γόνασι, καίπερ ὦν 485
 ἀκράτωρ ὁ τλήμων, χωλός. ἀλλὰ μὴ μ' ἀφῆις
 ἔρημον οὕτω χωρὶς ἀνθρώπων στίβου,
 ἀλλ' ἢ πρὸς οἶκον τὸν σὸν ἔκσωσόν μ' ἄγων,
 ἢ πρὸς τὰ Χαλκῶδοντος Εὐβοίας σταθμά·
 κάκεῖθεν οὗ μοι μακρὸς εἰς Οἶτην στόλος 490
 Τραχινίαν τε δεράδα καὶ τὸν εὐροον
 Σπερχεῖον ἔσται, πατρί μ' ὥς δείξις φίλωι,
 ὃν δὴ παλαιὸν ἐξότου δέδοικ' ἐγὼ
 μὴ μοι βεβήκηι. πολλὰ γὰρ τοῖς ἱγμένοις
 ἔστελλον αὐτὸν ἱκεσίους πέμπων λιτάς, 495
 αὐτόστολον πλεύσαντά μ' ἐκσῶσαι δόμους.
 ἀλλ' ἢ τέθνηκεν, ἢ τὰ τῶν διακόνων,
 ὥς εἰκός, οἶμαι, τοῦμὸν ἐν σμικρῷ μέρος
 ποιούμενοι τὸν οἶκαδ' ἠπειγον στόλον.
 νῦν δ', εἰς σέ γὰρ πομπὸν τε καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον 500

471 τοῖσδ' γ' οἷς B 480 ἴθ' ὤ: ὁθ' Φ 481 ἐμβαλοῦ Φ ὅποι Φ:
 ὅπου Φ 482 πρύμνην Elmsley: πρύμναν ὤ: πρύμναν θ' Φ ὅποι Φ: ὅπηι
 ὤ: ὅπου Φ 485 γόνασι Φ: γούνασι ὤ 491 δεράδα Τουρ: δειράδα ὤ
 493 παλαιὸν T: παλαιάν Φ: πάλαι ἂν οἱ ἂν ὤ 494 βεβήκηι Φ: -λει T: -κοι ὤ
 496 πλεύσαντα Φ: πέμπαντα ὤ δόμους Φ: δόμοις ὤ 498 μέρεις Φ: μέρει Φ

ἦκω, σὺ σῶσον, σὺ μ' ἔλεησον, εἰσορῶν
 ὥς πάντα δεινὰ κάπικινδύνως βροτοῖς
 κεῖται παθεῖν μὲν εὖ, παθεῖν δὲ θάτερα.
 χρή δ' ἐκτὸς ὄντα πημάτων τὰ δειν' ὄραν,
 χῶταν τις εὖ ζηι, τηνικαῦτα τὸν βίον
 σκοπεῖν μάλιστα μὴ διαφθαρεῖς λάθῃι.

505

Χο. οἴκτιρ', ἄναξ· πολλῶν ἔλε-
 ξεν δυσοίστων πόνων
 ὄθλ', οἷα μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν τύχοι φίλων.
 εἰ δὲ πικρούς, ἄναξ, ἔχθεις Ἀτρείδας,
 ἐγὼ μὲν, τὸ κείνων
 κακὸν τῶιδε κέρδος
 μετατιθέμενος, ἔνθαπερ ἐπιμέμενον,
 ἐπ' εὐστόλου ταχείας νεῶς
 πορεύσαιμ' ἄν ἐς δόμους, τὰν θεῶν
 νέμεσιν ἐκφυγών.

ἀντ.

510

515

Νε. ὄρα σὺ μὴ νῦν μὲν τις εὐχερῆς παρῆις,
 ὅταν δὲ πλησθῆις τῆς νόσου ξυνουσίαι,
 τότε οὐκέθ' αὐτὸς τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις φανῆις.

520

Χο. ἦκιστα· τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ποτ' εἰς ἐμὲ
 τοῦνιδος ξεῖς ἐνδίκως ὀνειδίσαι.

Νε. ἀλλ' αἰσχρὰ μέντοι σοῦ γέ μ' ἐνδεέστερον
 ξένωι φανῆναι πρὸς τὸ καίριον πονεῖν.
 ἀλλ', εἰ δοκεῖ, πλέωμεν, ὁρμάσθω ταχύς·
 χῆ ναῦς γὰρ ἄξει κοῦκ ἀπαρνηθήσεται.
 μόνον θεοὶ σώιζοιεν ἔκ τε τῆσδε γῆς
 ἡμᾶς, ὅποι τ' ἐνθύνδε βουλοίμεσθα πλεῖν.

525

Φι. ὦ φίλτατον μὲν ἦμαρ, ἡδιστος δ' ἀνὴρ,
 φίλοι δὲ ναῦται, πῶς ἄν ὑμῖν ἐμφανῆς
 ἔργωι γενοίμην, ὥς μ' ἔθεσθε προσφιλεῖ.
 ἴωμεν, ὦ παῖ, προσκύσαντε τὴν ἔσω
 ἄοικον εἰσοίκησιν, ὥς με καὶ μάθηις
 ἀφ' ὧν διέζων ὥς τ' ἔφυεν εὐκάρδιος.

530

535

509 οἷα Porson: ὅσσα οἱ ὅσα ὡ: ὅσων Φ: ἅττα Φ 515 μετατιθέμενος Σ, Φ: μέγα
 τιθέμενος ὡ ἐπιμέμενον Turnebus: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν ὡ: ἐπιμέμνηεν T 517 τὰν
 Hermann: τὰν ἐκ ὡ 521 οὐκέθ' Φ: οὐκέτ' ὡ αὐτὸς Φ: αὐτὸς ὡ 524
 γ' ἐμ' Φ 528 τε: Gernhard: δὲ ὡ: γε Φ 533 προσκύσαντε Φ: -οντες Φ:
 -αντες ὡ 534 εἰσοίκησιν Φ: εἰς οἱ ἐς οἴκησιν Φ: οἴκησιν Φ

- οἶμαι γὰρ οὐδ' ἂν ὄμμασιν μόνην θέαν
 ἄλλον λαβόντα πλὴν ἐμοῦ τλῆναι τάδε·
 ἐγὼ δ' ἀνάγκῃ προὔμαθον στέργειν κακά.
 Χο. ἐπίσχετον, μάθωμεν· ἄνδρε γὰρ δύο,
 ὁ μὲν νεὼς σῆς ναυβάτης, ὁ δ' ἀλλόθρους, 540
 χωρεῖτον, ὦν μαθόντες αὖθις εἴσιτον.

ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ

- Ἀχιλλέως παῖ, τόνδε τὸν ξυνέμπορον
 ὃς ἦν νεὼς σῆς σὺν δυοῖν ἄλλοιιν φύλαξ,
 ἐκέλευσ' ἐμοί σε ποῦ κυρῶν εἶης φράσαι,
 ἐπείπερ ἀντέκυσσα, δοξάζων μὲν οὐ, 545
 τύχηι δέ πως πρὸς ταῦτ' ὀρμισθεὶς πέδον.
 πλέων γὰρ ὥς ναύκληρος οὐ πολλῶι στόλῳ
 ἀπ' Ἰλίου πρὸς οἶκον ἐς τὴν εὐβοτρυν
 Πεπάρηθον, ὥς ἤκουσα τοὺς ναύτας ὅτι
 σοὶ πάντες εἶεν συννεναστοληκότες, 550
 ἔδοξέ μοι μὴ σῖγα, πρὶν φράσαιμί σοι,
 τὸν πλοῦν ποιεῖσθαι, προστυχόντι τῶν ἴσων.
 οὐδὲν σύ που κάτοιισθα τῶν σαυτοῦ πέρι,
 ἃ τοῖσιν Ἀργείοισιν ἀμφὶ σοῦ νέα
 βουλευμάτ' ἐστί, κοῦ μόνον βουλευμάτα 555
 ἀλλ' ἔργα δρώμεν', οὐκέτ' ἐξαργούμενα.
 Νε. ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις μὲν τῆς προμηθείας, ξένη,
 εἰ μὴ κακὸς πέφυκα, προσφιλεῖς μενεῖ.
 φράσον δ' ἅπερ γ' ἔλεξας, ὥς μάθω τί μοι
 νεώτερον βούλευμ' ἀπ' Ἀργείων ἔχεις. 560
 Εμ. φροῦδοι διώκοντές σε ναυτικῶι στόλῳ
 Φοῖνιξ θ' ὁ πρέσβυς οἱ τε Θησέως κόροι.
 Νε. ὥς ἐκ βίας μ' ἄξοντες ἢ λόγοις πάλιν;
 Εμ. οὐκ οἶδ'· ἀκούσας δ' ἄγγελος πάρειμί σοι.
 Νε. ἦ ταῦτα δὴ Φοῖνιξ τε χοῖ ξυνναυβάται 565
 οὔτω καθ' ὁρμὴν δρῶσιν Ἀτρειδῶν χάριν;
 Εμ. ὥς ταῦτ' ἐπίστω δρώμεν', οὐ μέλλοντ' ἔτι.

546 ὀρμισθεὶς Φ: -ιθεὶς or -ηθεὶς ὠ: συγκύρσας Φ 548 ἀπ' ὠ: ἐξ Φ 550
 συννεναστοληκότες Dobree: οἱ νεναν- ὠ 554 σοῦ νέα Auratus: σ' οὐνεκα ὠ: σοῦ
 'νεκα Φ 559 ἅπερ γ' ἔλεξας Φ: ἅπερ ἔλεξας ὠ 560 φέρεῖς Φ 562 θ'
 Φ: omitted ὠ

- Νε. πῶς οὖν Ὀδυσσεὺς πρὸς τὰδ' οὐκ αὐτάγγελος
πλεῖν ἦν ἐτοῖμος; ἢ φόβος τις εἶργε νιν;
Εμ. κείνός γ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἄνδρ' ὁ Τυδέως τε παῖς 570
ἔσπελλον, ἡνίκ' ἐξανηγόμην ἐγώ.
Νε. πρὸς ποῖον αὖ τόνδ' αὐτὸς Οὐδυσσεὺς ἔπλει;
Εμ. ἦν δὴ τις – ἀλλὰ τόνδε μοι πρῶτον φράσον
τίς ἐστιν· ἂν λέγῃς δὲ μὴ φώνει μέγα.
Νε. ὅδ' ἔσθ' ὁ κλεινός σοι Φιλοκτήτης, ξένε. 575
Εμ. μή νύν μ' ἔρηι τὰ πλείον', ἀλλ' ὅσον τάχος
ἔκπλει σεαυτὸν ξυλλαβὼν ἐκ τῆσδε γῆς.
Φι. τί φησιν, ὦ παῖ; τί με κατὰ σκότον ποτὲ
διεμπολαῖ λόγιοις πρὸς σ' ὁ ναυβάτης;
Νε. οὐκ οἶδά πω τί φησι· δεῖ δ' αὐτὸν λέγειν 580
ἐς φῶς ὃ λέξει, πρὸς σὲ κάμει τούσδε τε.
Εμ. ὦ σπέρμ' Ἀχιλλέως, μή με διαβάλῃς στρατῶι
λέγονθ' ἅ μὴ δεῖ· πόλλ' ἐγὼ κείνων ὕπο
δρῶν ἀντιπάσχω χρηστά θ', οἷ' ἀνὴρ πένης.
Νε. ἐγὼ εἰμ' Ἀτρεΐδαις δυσμενής· οὗτος δέ μοι 585
φίλος μέγιστος, οὐνεκ' Ἀτρεΐδας στυγεῖ.
δεῖ δὴ σ', ἔμοιγ' ἐλθόντα προσφιλεῖ, λόγων
κρύψαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς μηδέν' ὦν ἀκήκοας.
Εμ. ὅρα τί ποιεῖς, παῖ. Νε. σκοπῶ κάγῳ πάλαι.
Εμ. σὲ θήσομαι τῶνδ' αἴτιον. Νε. ποιοῦ λέγων. 590
Εμ. λέγω· 'πὶ τοῦτον ἄνδρε τῷδ' ὥπερ κλύεις,
ὁ Τυδέως παῖς ἦ τ' Ὀδυσσεὺς βία,
διώμοτοι πλέουσιν ἢ μὴν ἢ λόγῳ
πείσαντες ἄξειν, ἢ πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος.
καὶ ταῦτ' Ἀχαιοὶ πάντες ἤκουον σαφῶς 595
Ὀδυσσεὺς λέγοντος· οὗτος γὰρ πλεόν
τὸ θάρσος εἶχε θάτέρου δράσειν τάδε.
Νε. τίνος δ' Ἀτρεΐδαι τοῦδ' ἄγαν οὕτω χρόνῳ
τοσῶιδ' ἐπεστρέφοντο πράγματος χάριν,
ὅν γ' εἶχον ἤδη χρόνιον ἐκβεβληκότες; 600

569 ἢ Brunck: ἢ ὦ 571 ἐγὼ Φ: ἔσω ὦ 572 αὖ Dobree: ἂν ὦ
Οὐδυσσεὺς Φ: Ὀδ- ὦ 574 ἂν Markland: ἂν ὦ 576 νύν Brunck (pr.
Scaliger): νῦν ὦ 577 σεαυτῶι Φ 583 λέγων θ' Φ 584 θ' Dobree:
γ' ὦ 585 εἰμ' Φ: 'μ' ὦ: μὲν Φ 587 λόγων Burges: λόγον ὦ 588
μηδέν Φ 591 ὥσπερ Φ 594 πείσαντέ γ' Φ 595 ἤκουσαν Φ
597 πρᾶσσειν Φ 600 γ' Φ: τ' ὦ: omitted Φ

- τίς ὁ πόθος αὐτοὺς ἵκετ'; ἢ θεῶν βία
καὶ νέμεσις, οἵπερ ἔργ' ἀμύνουσιν κακά;
Εμ. ἐγὼ σὲ τοῦτ', ἴσως γὰρ οὐκ ἀκήκοας,
πᾶν ἐκδιδάξω. μάντις ἦν τις εὐγενής,
Πριάμου μὲν υἱός, ὄνομα δ' ὠνομάζετο 605
Ἔλενος, ὃν οὗτος νυκτὸς ἐξελθὼν μόνος
ὁ πάντ' ἀκούων αἰσχροὶ καὶ λωβήτ' ἔπη
δόλιος Ὀδυσσεὺς εἶλε· δέσμιόν τ' ἄγων
ἔδειξ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἐς μέσον, θήραν καλήν·
ὃς δὴ τὰ τ' ἄλλ' αὐτοῖσι πάντ' ἐθέσπισεν 610
καὶ τὰπὶ Τροίαι πέργαμ' ὥς οὐ μὴ ποτε
πέρσοιεν, εἰ μὴ τόνδε πείσαντες λόγῳ
ἄγοιντο νήσου τῆσδ' ἐφ' ἧς ναίει τὰ νῦν.
καὶ ταῦθ' ὅπως ἤκουσ' ὁ Λαέρτου τόκος
τὸν μάντιν εἰπόντ', εὐθέως ὑπέσχετο 615
τὸν ἄνδρ' Ἀχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν ἄγων·
οἶοιτο μὲν μάλισθ' ἐκούσιον λαβὼν,
εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ', ἄκοντα· καὶ τούτων κάρα
τέμνειν ἐφεῖτο τῷ θέλοντι μὴ τυχών.
ἤκουσας, ὦ παῖ, πάντα· τὸ σπεύδειν δέ σοι 620
καὐτῷ παραινῶ κεί τινος κήδηι πέρι.
- Φι. οἶμοι τάλας. ἢ κείνος, ἢ πᾶσα βλάβη,
ἔμ' εἰς Ἀχαιοὺς ὤμοσεν πείσας στελεῖν;
πεισθήσομαι γὰρ ὧδε κάξ' Αἰδου θανῶν
πρὸς φῶς ἀνελθεῖν, ὥσπερ οὐκείνου πατήρ. 625
- Εμ. οὐκ οἶδ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ'· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν εἴμ' ἐπὶ
ναῦν, σφῶιν δ' ὅπως ἄριστα συμφέροι θεός.
- Φι. οὐκουν τάδ', ὦ παῖ, δεινά, τὸν Λαερτίου
ἔμ' ἐλπίσαι ποτ' ἂν λόγοισι μαλθακοῖς
δεῖξαι νεὼς ἄγοντ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέσοις; 630
οὐ· θᾶσσον ἂν τῆς πλεῖστον ἐχθίστης ἐμοὶ
κλύοιμ' ἐχίδνης, ἢ μ' ἔθηκεν ὧδ' ἄπουν.
ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐκείνῳ πάντα λεκτά, πάντα δέ
τολμητά· καὶ νῦν οἶδ' ὁθούνεχ' ἴξεται.
ἀλλ', ὦ τέκνον, χωρῶμεν, ὥς ἡμᾶς πολὺ 635

601 ἢ Ll-J and Wilson: ἢ ὦ βία ὠ: φθόνος Φ 608 δ' Φ 612
πέρσειεν Φ: -σωσιν Φ 614 Λαερτίου Φ γόνος Φ 618 τούτου Φ
619 ὑφείτο Φ 622 ἢ ὠ: ἢ Φ 629 ἂν ὠ: ἐν Φ

- πέλαγος ὀρίζηι τῆς Ὀδυσσέως νεώς.
 ἴωμεν· ἦ τοι καίριος σπουδῇ, πόνου
 λήξαντος, ὕπνον κἀνάπαυλαν ἤγαγεν.
 Νε. οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴν πνεῦμα τοῦκ πρῶιρας ἀνῆι,
 τότε στελοῦμεν· νῦν γὰρ ἀντιστατεῖ. 640
 Φι. ἀεὶ καλὸς πλοῦς ἔσθ', ὅταν φεύγηις κακά.
 Νε. οἶδ'· ἀλλὰ κἀκείνοισι ταῦτ' ἐναντία.
 Φι. οὐκ ἔστι ληισταῖς πνεῦμ' ἐναντιούμενον,
 ὅταν παρῇι κλέψαι τε χάρπάσαι βίαι.
 Νε. ἀλλ', εἰ δοκεῖ, χωρῶμεν, ἔνδοθεν λαβῶν
 ὅτου σε χρεῖα καὶ πόθος μάλιστ' ἔχει. 645
 Φι. ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὧν δεῖ, καίπερ οὐ πολλῶν ἄπο.
 Νε. τί τοῦθ' ὃ μὴ νεὼς γε τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπι;
 Φι. φύλλον τί μοι πάρεστιν, ὧι μάλιστ' ἀεὶ
 κοιμῶ τόδ' ἔλκος, ὥστε πραῦνεν πάνυ. 650
 Νε. ἀλλ' ἔκφερ' αὐτό. τί γὰρ ἔτ' ἀλλ' ἐραῖς λαβεῖν;
 Φι. εἴ μοι τι τόξων τῶνδ' ἀπημελημένον
 παρερρῦηκεν, ὥς λίπω μὴ τῶι λαβεῖν.
 Νε. ἦ ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ κλεινὰ τόξ' ἃ νῦν ἔχεις;
 Φι. ταῦτ', οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἔστ', ἀλλ' ἃ βαστάζω χεροῖν. 655
 Νε. ἄρ' ἔστιν ὥστε κἀγγύθεν θεὸν λαβεῖν,
 καὶ βαστάσαι με προσκύσαι θ' ὥσπερ θεόν;
 Φι. σοί γ', ὦ τέκνον, καὶ τοῦτο κἄλλο τῶν ἐμῶν
 ὅποῖον ἂν σοι ξυμφέρηι γενήσεται.
 Νε. καὶ μὴν ἐρῶ γε· τὸν δ' ἔρωθ' οὕτως ἔχω· 660
 εἴ μοι θέμις, θέλοιμ' ἂν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, πάρες.
 Φι. ὁσιά τε φωνεῖς ἔστι τ', ὦ τέκνον, θέμις,
 ὅς γ' ἡλίου τόδ' εἰσορᾷ ἐμοὶ φάος
 μόνος δέδωκας, ὅς χθόν' Οἰταίαν ἰδεῖν,
 ὅς πατέρα πρέσβυν, ὅς φίλους, ὅς τῶν ἐμῶν 665
 ἐχθρῶν μ' ἐνερθεν ὄντ' ἀνέστησας πέρα.
 θάρσει, παρέσται ταῦτά σοι καὶ θιγγάνειν
 καὶ δόντι δοῦναι κἀξεπεύξασθαι βροτῶν
 ἀρετῆς ἕκατι τῶνδ' ἐπιπαῦσαι μόνον·

636 ὀρίζηι Lambinus: -ει ὠ νεὼς ὠ: βίας Φ 639 πνεύματ' ἐκ Φ: πνεῦμα
 τοῦ Φ ἀνῆι Σ, Lambinus: ἀηι ὠ: ἀγῆι Φ: ῥάηι Φ 642 οἶδ'· ἀλλὰ Doed-
 erlein: οὐκ· ἀλλὰ ὠ: οὐκουν ἀλλὰ Φ 645 ἐνδοθι Φ 648 ἐπι Auratus: ἐνι
 ὠ 650 ἀλγος Φ πόνον Φ 652 ἀπημελημένων Φ 655 ἀλλ'
 ἔστ', ἀλλ' Seyffert: ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ἀλλ' Φ: ἀλλα γ' ἔσθ' Φ 663 τόδ' Φ: τότ' Φ: τό γ' Φ
 666 μ' omitted Φ 669 μόνος Φ

- εὐεργετῶν γὰρ καὐτὸς αὐτ' ἔκτησάμην. 670
- Ne. οὐκ ἄχθομαί σ' ἰδὼν τε καὶ λαβὼν φίλον·
 ὅστις γὰρ εὖ δρᾶν εὖ παθῶν ἐπίσταται,
 παντὸς γένοιτ' ἂν κτήματος κρείσσων φίλος.
 χωροῖς ἂν εἴσω. Φι. καὶ σέ γ' εἰσάξω· τὸ γὰρ
 νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε συμπαραστάτην λαβεῖν. 675
- Χο. λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσ', ὅπωπα δ' οὐ μάλα 87 στρ. α
 τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ (τῶν) Διὸς
 [Ιξίονα] κατ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα
 δέσμιον ὥς ἔβαλεν
 παγκρατῆς Κρόνου παῖς· 680
 ἄλλον δ' οὐτὶν' ἔγωγ'
 οἶδα κλύων οὐδ' ἐσιδὼν μοίραι
 τοῦδ' ἐχθίονι συντυχόντα θνατῶν,
 ὅς οὔτ' ἔρξας τιν' οὔτε νοσφίσας,
 ἀλλ' ἴσος ἔν (γ') ἴσοις ἀνὴρ 685
 ὦλλυθ' ὥδ' ἀναξίως.
 τόδε (δ' αὖ) θαῦμά μ' ἔχει,
 πῶς ποτε πῶς ποτ' ἀμφιπλήκτων
 ῥοθίων μόνος κλύων, πῶς
 ἄρα πανδάκρυτον οὕτω 690a
 βιοτὰν κατέσχευ. 690b
- ἴν' αὐτὸς ἦν πρόσσυρος, οὐκ ἔχων βάσιν 87 αντ. α
 οὐδέ τιν' ἐγγύρων κακογείτονα
 παρ' ὧι στόνον ἀντίτυπον
 (τὸν) βαρυβρῶτ' ἀποκλαύ-
 σειεν αἵματηρόν· 695
 οὐδ' ὅς [τὰν] θερμοτάταν
 αἰμάδα κηκιομέναν ἑλκέων
 ἐνθήρου ποδὸς ἡπίοισι φύλλοις
 κατευνάσειεν, εἴ τις ἐμπέσοι,

671-3 attributed to Ne. by Doederlein: attributed to Phil. by W 677 (τῶν) Por-
 son: (τοῦ) T 678 [Ιξίονα] deleted by Erfurdt 679 ἔβαλεν Φ: ἔλαβ' ὁ W
 682 ἐσιδὼν Wakefield: ἐσίδων Φ: ἐσίδον or -εἶδον W 684 οὐτ' ἔρξας τι Φ: οὔτε
 τι ῥέξας B 685 ἴσος W: ἴσως Φ (γ') added by Hermann 687 (δ' αὖ)
 added by Hermann 689 κλύων Φ: κλύζων W: κλυζόμενος Φ 694 (τὸν)
 added by Dain 696 [τὰν] deleted by Erfurdt 698 φύλλοις Φ: φύλλοισι W
 699 εἰ W: (οὐδ') εἰ Φ

	φορβάδος ἔκ τι γᾶς ἑλών· εἶρπε δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλ(αχ)αῖ τότ' ἂν εἰλυόμενος, παῖς ἄτερ ὥς φίλας τιθήνας, ὄθεν εὐμάρει' ὑπάρχου πόρου, ἀνίκ' ἐξανείη δακέθυμος ἄτα·	700 705a 705b
	οὐ φορβὰν ἱερᾶς γᾶς σπόρον, οὐκ ἄλλων αἶρων τῶν νεμόμεσθ' ἄνδρες ἀλφησταί, πλήν ἐξ ὠκυβόλων εἴ ποτε τόξων πτανοῖς ἰοῖς ἀνύσειε γαστρὶ φορβάν. ὦ μελέα ψυχᾶ, ὅς μηδ' οἶνοχύτου πώματος ἦσθη δεκέτει χρόνῳ, λεύσσων δ' ὅπου γνοίη στατὸν εἰς ὕδωρ αἶει προσενώμα.	στρ. β 710 714-15
	νῦν δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν παιδὸς ὑπαντήσας εὐδαίμων ἀνύσει καὶ μέγας ἐκ κείνων· ὅς νιν ποντοπόρῳ δούρατι, πλήθει πολλῶν μηνῶν, πατρίαν ἄγει πρὸς αὐλάν Μηλιάδων νυμφᾶν Σπερχεῖοῦ τε παρ' ὄχθαις, ἴν' ὁ χάλκασπις ἀνὴρ θεοῖς πλάθει, θεὸς θείῳ πυρὶ παμφαῆς, Οἴτας ὑπὲρ ὄχθων.	ἀντ. β 720 725 726-7
Νε.	ἔρπ', εἰ θέλεις. τί δὴ ποθ' ὦδ' ἐξ οὐδενὸς λόγου σιωπαῖς κάπτόπληκτος ὦδ' ἔχη;	730
Φι.	ἄ ἄ ἄ ἄ.	
Νε.	τί ἔστιν;	
Φι.	οὐδὲν δεινόν· ἀλλ' ἴθ', ὦ τέκνον.	
Νε.	μῶν ἅλγος ἴσχεις τῆς παρεστῶσης νόσου;	
Φι.	οὐ δῆτ' ἔγωγ', ἀλλ' ἄρτι κουφίζειν δοκῶ. ἰὼ θεοί.	735

700 τι γᾶς Hartung: τε γᾶς ὠ 701 εἶρπε Bothe: ἔρπει ὠ δ' Hermann:
γάρ ὠ: omitted T ἄλλ(αχ)αῖ Campbell: ἄλλαι ὠ: ἀλλὰ γὰρ T 704
ἐνθεν Φ ὑπάρχου Φ: -ει ὠ 705a πόρου Wakefield: πόρων ὠ: πόρον Φ
ἐξανείη Hermann: ἐξανίει Φ: ἐξανίη T: ἐξανίησι ὠ 711-12 πτανοῖς ἰοῖς ἀνύ-
σειε Bruck: πτανῶν ἀνύσειε πτανοῖς ὠ: πτανῶν πτανοῖς ἀνύσειε Φ 714-15
πώματος ΦT: ποματος ὠ δεκέτει Φ: δεκάτει Φ: δεκέτη Φ 716 λεύσσειν
Φ 717 αἶει T: αἶει ὠ 724 πατρίαν Porson: πατρώϊαν ὠ ἀνάγει Φ
726-7 ὄχθαις ὠ: ὄχθας Hermann 728 πλάθη Φ θεὸς Hermann: πᾶσι ὠ
729 ὄχθων ὠ: ὄχθας Φ 732 ἄ ἄ ἄ Φ 734 ἴσχει Φ 736 ὦ Φ

- Νε. τί τοὺς θεοὺς οὕτως ἀναστένων καλεῖς;
 Φι. σωτῆρας αὐτοὺς ἡπίους θ' ἡμῖν μολεῖν.
 ἄ ἄ ἄ ἄ.
- Νε. τί ποτε πέπονθας; οὐκ ἔρεῖς, ἀλλ' ὧδ' ἔσθι
 σιγηλός; ἐν κακῶι δὲ τῶι φαίνῃ κυρῶν. 740
- Φι. ἀπόλωλα, τέκνον, κοῦ δυνήσσομαι κακὸν
 κρύψαι παρ' ὑμῖν, ἄτταταῖ· διέρχεται,
 διέρχεται δύστηνος, ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.
 ἀπόλωλα τέκνον· βρῦκομαι, τέκνον· παπαῖ, 745
 ἀπαππαπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ.
 πρὸς θεῶν, πρόχειρον εἴ τί σοι, τέκνον, πάρα
 ξίφος χεροῖν, πάταξον εἰς ἄκρον πόδα·
 ἀπάμησον ὡς τάχιστα· μὴ φείσῃ βίου.
 ἴθ', ὦ παῖ. 750
- Νε. τί δ' ἔστιν οὕτω νεοχμὸν ἐξαίφνης, οἶτον
 τοσὴνδ' ἰυγὴν καὶ στόνον σαυτοῦ ποῇ;
 Φι. οἶσθ', ὦ τέκνον; Νε. τί ἔστιν; Φι. οἶσθ', ὦ παῖ. Νε. τί σοι;
 οὐκ οἶδα. Φι. πῶς οὐκ οἶσθα; παππαπαππαπαῖ.
- Νε. δεινὸν γε τοῦπίσαγμα τοῦ νοσήματος. 755
 Φι. δεινὸν γὰρ οὐδὲ ῥητόν· ἀλλ' οἴκτιρέ με.
 Νε. τί δῆτα δράσω; Φι. μὴ με ταρβήσας προδῶις.
 ἦκει γὰρ αὕτη διὰ χρόνου, πλάνοις ἴσως
 ὡς ἐξεπλήσθη. Νε. ἰὼ ἰὼ δύστηνε σύ,
 δύστηνε δῆτα διὰ πόνων πάντων φανείς. 760
 βούλῃ λάβωμαι δῆτα καὶ θίγω τί σου; 762
- Φι. μὴ δῆτα τοῦτό γ'· ἀλλὰ μοι τὰ τόξ' ἐλὼν
 τάδ', ὥσπερ ἦιτον μ' ἄρτίως, ἔως ἀνῇ
 τὸ πῆμα τοῦτο τῆς νόσου τὸ νῦν παρόν,
 σῶιζ' αὐτὰ καὶ φύλασσε. λαμβάνει γὰρ οὖν
 ὕπνος μ', ὅταν περ τὸ κακὸν ἐξίῃ τόδε·
 κοῦκ ἔστι λῆξαι πρότερον· ἀλλ' ἔἴην χρεῶν
 ἔκκλητον εὐδεῖν. ἦν δὲ τῶιδε τῶι χρόνῳ
 μόλωσ' ἐκεῖνοι, πρὸς θεῶν, ἐφίεμαι 770

737 οὕτως Φ: omitted ὦ 739 ἄ ἄ ἄ Φ 742 δλωλα Φ 745 βρύ-
 χομαι Φ 746 ἀπαππαπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ Hermann: ἀπα παπαῖ
 παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ ὦ: omitted Φ 751 ἔστι τοῦτο Φ 752 ποῇ Jebb:
 πο(ι)εῖς ὦ 753 τί δ' ἔστιν Φ 753-4 changes of speakers restored by Purgold
 758 πλάνης Φ 759 ἰὼ Φ: φεῦ ἰὼ (φεῦ attributed to Phil.) Τ ἰὼ (ἰὼ) inserted
 after σύ: Φ 760 attributed to Phil. Φ 764 ἄν ἦι Φ 765 τὰ νῦν Φ
 767 ἐξίῃ Φ: -ῆι Φ: -ίκη Φ: -ῆκη Φ 769 ἐκκλητον Τ εὐδεῖν μ' Φ εἴ
 Φ τῶιδε τῶι χρόνῳ ὦ: τῶι χρόνῳ τάδε Φ

- ἐκόντα μήτ' ἄκοντα μήτε τωι τέχνηι
 κείνοις μεθεῖναι ταῦτα, μὴ σαυτόν θ' ἅμα
 κάμ', ὄντα σαυτοῦ πρόστροπον, κτείνας γένηι.
- Νε. θάρσει προνοίας οὔνεκ' οὐ δοθήσεται
 πλὴν σοί τε κάμοι· ξὺν τύχηι δὲ πρόσφερε. 775
- Φι. ἰδού, δέχου, παῖ· τὸν φθόνον δὲ πρόσκυσον,
 μή σοι γενέσθαι πολὺπόν' αὐτά, μηδ' ὅπως
 ἔμοι τε καὶ τῶι πρόσθ' ἔμοῦ κεκτημένωι.
- Νε. ὦ θεοί, γένοιτο ταῦτα νῶϊν· γένοιτο δὲ
 πλοῦς οὐριός τε κεῦσταλῆς ὅποι ποτὲ 780
 θεὸς δικαιοῖ χῶ στόλος πορσύνεται.
- Φι. ἄ ἄ ἄ ἄ.
 δέδοικα (δ'), ὦ παῖ, μὴ ἀτελὴς εὐχή (τύχηι). 782a
 στάζει γὰρ αὖ μοι φοίνιον τόδ' ἐκ βυθοῦ
 κηκῖον αἶμα, καὶ τι προσδοκῶ νέον.
 παπαῖ, φεῦ. 785
 παπαῖ μάλ', ὦ πούς, οἶά μ' ἐργάσῃ κακά.
 προσέρπει,
 προσέρχεται τόδ' ἐγγύς. οἶμοι μοι τάλας.
 ἔχετε τὸ πράγμα· μὴ φύγητε μηδαμῇ.
 ἄτταταῖ. 790
 ὦ ξένη Κεφαλλήν, εἶθε σοῦ διαμπερὲς
 στέρνων ἔχοιτ' ἄλγησις ἦδε. φεῦ, παπαῖ,
 παπαῖ μάλ' αὔθις. ὦ διπλοῖ στρατηλάται,
 Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε, πῶς ἂν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ
 τὸν ἴσον χρόνον τρέφοιτε τήνδε τὴν νόσον. 795
 ὦμοι μοι.
 ὦ Θάνατε Θάνατε, πῶς αἰὲ καλούμενος
 οὔτω κατ' ἡμαρ οὐ δύνῃ μολεῖν ποτε;
 ὦ τέκνον, ὦ γενναῖον, ἀλλὰ συλλαβὼν
 τῶι Λημνίωι τῶιδ' ἀνακαλουμένωι πυρί 800
 ἔμπρησον, ὦ γενναῖε· κἀγὼ τοί ποτε
 τὸν τοῦ Διὸς παῖδ' ἀντὶ τῶνδε τῶν ὀπλων,
 ἄ νῦν σὺ σώιζεις, τοῦτ' ἐπηξίωσα δρᾶν.
 τί φήις, παῖ;

771 μήτ' ὠ: μηδ' B μήτε τωι ὠ: μηδέ τωι Φ 772 ταῦτα omitted Φ
 774 προνοίας γ' Φ 782 ἄ ἄ ἄ ἄ Philp: ἀλλὰ ὠ: ἀλλ' οὔν Φ, T 782a
 δέδοικα... (τύχηι) Wunder: δέδοικ', ὦ παῖ μὴ μ' ἀτελὴς εὐχή ὠ 783 φοίνιον
 Φ: φόνιον ὠ 787 omitted Φ 788 οἶμοι ὠ: ὦμοι Φ: omitted Φ 789
 φύγοιτε Φ 803 σοι Φ: omitted Φ

- τί φῆις; τί σιγαῖς; ποῦ ποτ' ὦν, τέκνον, κυρεῖς; 805
- Νε. ἀλγῶ πάλαι δὴ τάπτι σοὶ στένων κακά.
- Φι. ἀλλ', ὦ τέκνον, καὶ θάρσος ἴσχυ' ὥς ἦδε μοι
ὀξεῖα φοιτᾷ καὶ ταχεῖ' ἀπέρχεται.
ἀλλ' ἀντιάζω, μὴ με καταλίπηις μόνον.
- Νε. θάρσει, μενούμεν. Φι. ἦ μενεῖς; Νε. σαφῶς φρόνει. 810
- Φι. οὐ μὴν σ' ἔνορκόν γ' ἀξίῳ θέσθαι, τέκνον.
- Νε. ὥς οὐ θέμις γ' ἐμοῦστι σοῦ μολεῖν ἄτερ.
- Φι. ἔμβαλλε χειρὸς πίστιν. Νε. ἐμβάλλω μενεῖν.
- Φι. ἐκεῖσε νῦν μ', ἐκεῖσε— Νε. ποῖ λέγεις; Φι. ἄνω—
- Νε. τί παραφρονεῖς αὖ; τί τὸν ἄνω λεύσσεις κύκλον; 815
- Φι. μέθες, μέθες με. Νε. ποῖ μεθῶ; Φι. μέθες ποτέ.
- Νε. οὐ φημ' ἐάσειν. Φι. ἀπό μ' ὀλεῖς, ἦν προσθήγῃς.
- Νε. καὶ δὴ μεθίημ', (εἶ) τι δὴ πλεόν φρονεῖς.
- Φι. ὦ γαῖα, δέξαι θανάσιμόν μ' ὅπως ἔχω·
τὸ γὰρ κακὸν τόδ' οὐκέτ' ὀρθοῦσθαι μ' ἔαι. 820
- Νε. τὸν ἄνδρ' ἔοικεν ὕπνος οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου
ἔξειν· κάρα γὰρ ὑπτιάζεται τόδε.
ἰδρῶς γέ τοί νιν πᾶν καταστάζει δέμας,
μέλαινά τ' ἄκρου τις παρέρρωγεν ποδὸς
αἰμορραγῆς φλέψ. ἀλλ' ἐάσωμεν, φίλοι,
ἔκκλητον αὐτόν, ὥς ἂν εἰς ὕπνον πέσῃ. 825
- Χο. Ὑπν' ὀδύννας ἀδαῆς, Ὑπνε δ' ἀλγέων 8τρ.
εὐατῆς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις, (εὐαίων),
εὐαίων, ὦναξ· ὄμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις 830
τάνδ' αἶγλαν, ἃ τέταται τανῦν.
ἴθι ἴθι μοι Παιών.
ὦ τέκνον, ὄρα ποῦ στάσῃ,
ποῖ δὲ βάσῃ, πῶς δέ μοι τάντεῦθεν
φροντίδος. ὀρᾷς ἤδη. 835
πρὸς τί μένομεν πράσσειν;
καιρὸς τοι πάντων γνῶμαν ἴσχων
(πολύ τι) πολὺ παρὰ πόδα κράτος ἄρνυται.

805 ὦ Φ 808 ἐπέρχεται Φ 811 γ' omitted Φ 812 ἐμοῦστι Hermann: ἐμοί 'στι ὡ: ἐμ' ἴσθι Φ 813 μενεῖν Φ: μένειν ὡ 814 μ' omitted Φ
818 (εἶ) τι δὴ Hermann: τι δὴ ὡ: τι δὲ δὴ Φ: σε· τι δὴ Φ Τ 823 δέ Φ 827
ἀχέων Φ 829 (εὐαίων) Τ: omitted ὡ 830 ἄναξ Φ ἀντίσχοις Σ
Musgrave: ἀντέχοις ὡ 832 ἴθι μοι ἴθι μοι Φ 834 ποῖ ὡ: ποῦ Φ 836
μένομεν Erfurd: μενούμεν ὡ 838 (πολύ τι) Hermann

- Νε. ἄλλ' ὅδε μὲν κλύει οὐδέν, ἐγὼ δ' ὀρῶ οὐνεκα θήραν
 τήνδ' ἀλίως ἔχομεν τόξων, δίχα τοῦδε πλέοντες. 840
 τοῦδε γὰρ ὁ στέφανος, τοῦτον θεὸς εἶπε κομίζειν.
 κομπεῖν δ' ἔστ' ἀτελῇ σὺν ψεύδεσιν αἰσχροὺν ὄνειδος.
- Χο. ἀλλά, τέκνον, τάδε μὲν θεὸς ὀψεται· 840
 ὦν δ' ἂν (κ)ἀμείβηι μ' αὔθις, βαιάν μοι,
 βαιάν, ὦ τέκνον, πέμπε λόγων φήμαν· 845
 ὡς πάντων ἐν νόσωι εὐδρακῆς
 ὕπνος ἄυπνος λεύσσειν.
 ἄλλ' ὅτι δύναι μάκιστον
 κεῖνο (δῆ) μοι, κεῖνο (μοι) λαθραίως 850
 ἐξιδού ὅπως πράξεις.
 οἴσθα γὰρ ὃν αὐδῶμαι.
 εἰ ταύταν τούτῳ γνῶμαν ἴσχεις,
 μάλα τοι ἄπορα πυκινοῖς ἐνιδεῖν πάθη.
- οὔρός τοι, τέκνον, οὔρος· ἀνὴρ 840
 δ' ἀνόμματος, οὐδ' ἔχων ἄρωγάν,
 ἐκτέταται νύχιος
 – ἀδεῆς ὕπνος ἐσθλός –
 οὐ χερός, οὐ ποδός, οὐ τινος ἄρχων, 860
 ἀλλὰ τις ὡς Αἴδαι πάρα κείμενος.
 ὄρα, βλέπ' εἰ καίρια φθέγγηι·
 τὸ δ' ἀλώσιμον ἐμαῖ φροντίδι, παῖ,
 πόνος ὁ μὴ φοβῶν κράτιστος.
- Νε. σιγαῖν κελεύω, μηδ' ἀφεστάναι φρενῶν. 865
 κινεῖ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ὄμμα κἀνάγει κάρα.
- Φι. ὦ φέγγος ὕπνου διάδοχον, τό τ' ἐλπιδῶν
 ἄπιστον οἰκούρημα τῶνδε τῶν ξένων·
 οὐ γὰρ ποτ', ὦ παῖ, τοῦτ' ἂν ἐξηύχῃς· ἐγώ,

844 (κ)ἀμείβηι Hermann: ἀμείβηι ὦ μ' ὦ: σύ μ' Τ 845 φάμαν
 Φ 849 δύναι Φ: δυναιο ὦ 850 (δῆ) Hermann (μοι) Kuiper
 λαθραίως Campbell: λάθραι ὦ 851 ὅπως Φ: ὅτι πῶς Φ: ὅτι ὦ 852 ὃν Φ:
 ὦν Φ: ὦι Φ 853 ταύταν Φ: ταυτάν ὦ: ταυτάν Φ: (εἴτ') αὐτάν Φ Ἰσχεις Φ:
 ἔχεις ὦ 854 πυκινοῖς Τ: πυκινούσιν Φ: πυκνοῖς ὦ: πυκνοῖς Σ 855 ἀνὴρ
 Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ 859 ἀδεῆς Reiske: ἀλεῆς ὦ ἐσθλός ὕπνος Φ 861
 ἀλλὰ τις ὡς Wunder: ἀλλ' ὡς τις ὦ: ἀλλ' ὅστις Φ πάρα κείμενος Dindorf: παρακεί-
 μενος ὦ 862 ὄρα, βλέπ' εἰ Hermann: ὄρᾳ, βλέπει ὦ φθέγγηι Φ: φθέγγου
 Φ: φθέγγει ὦ 866 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ

- τλήναι σ' ἔλεινῶς ὥδε τὰμὰ πῆματα
 μῆναι παρόντα καὶ ξυνωφελοῦντά μοι.
 οὐκουν Ἀτρεΐδα τοῦτ' ἔτλησαν εὐφώρως
 οὕτως ἐνεγκεῖν, ἀγαθοὶ στρατηλάται.
 ἀλλ', εὐγενὴς γὰρ ἡ φύσις κὰξ εὐγενῶν,
 ὦ τέκνον, ἡ σή, πάντα ταῦτ' ἐν εὐχερεῖ
 ἔθου, βοῆς τε καὶ δυσσομίας γέμων.
 καὶ νῦν ἐπειδὴ τοῦδε τοῦ κακοῦ δοκεῖ
 λήθη τις εἶναι κἀνάπαντα δῆ, τέκνον,
 σύ μ' αὐτὸς ἄρον, σύ με κατὰστησον, τέκνον,
 ἴν', ἡνίκ' ἂν κόπος μ' ἀπαλλάξῃ ποτέ,
 ὁρμώμεθ' ἔς ναῦν μηδ' ἐπίσχωμεν τὸ πλεῖν.
 Νε. ἀλλ' ἥδομαι μὲν σ' εἰσιδὼν παρ' ἐλπίδα
 ἀνώδυνον βλέποντα κάμπνέοντ' ἔτι·
 ὥς οὐκέτ' ὄντος γὰρ τὰ συμβόλαιά σου
 πρὸς τὰς παρούσας ξυφορὰς ἐφαίνετο.
 νῦν δ' αἶρε σαυτόν· εἰ δέ σοι μᾶλλον φίλον,
 οἴσουσί σ' οἶδε· τοῦ πόνου γὰρ οὐκ ὄκνος,
 ἐπείπερ οὕτω σοί τ' ἔδοξ' ἐμοὶ τε δρᾶν.
 Φι. αἰνῶ τάδ', ὦ παῖ, καὶ μ' ἔπαιρ', ὥσπερ νοεῖς·
 τούτους δ' ἔασον, μὴ βαρυνθῶσιν κακῇ
 ὁσμῇ πρὸ τοῦ δέοντος· οὐπὶ νηϊ γὰρ
 ἅλις πόνος τούτοισι συνναίειν ἐμοί.
 Νε. ἔσται τάδ'· ἀλλ' ἴστω τε καὶ τὸς ἀντέχου.
 Φι. θάρσει· τό τοι σύνθηες ὀρθώσει μ' ἔθος.
 Νε. παπαῖ· τί δῆτ' (ἂν) δρῶιμ' ἐγὼ τούνθενδε γε;
 Φι. τί δ' ἔστιν, ὦ παῖ; ποῖ ποτ' ἐξέβρης λόγῳ;
 Νε. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅππῃ χρὴ τᾶπορον τρέπειν ἔπος.
 Φι. ἀπορεῖς δὲ τοῦ σύ; μὴ λέγ', ὦ τέκνον, τάδε.
 Νε. ἀλλ' ἐνθάδ' ἤδη τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους κυρῶ.
 Φι. οὐ δὴ σε δυσχέρεια τοῦ νοσήματος
 ἔπαισεν ὥστε μὴ μ' ἄγειν ναύτην ἔτι;
 Νε. ἅπαντα δυσχέρεια, τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν

870 ἔλεινῶς Φ: ἔλεινῶς (ωΣ
 naer): εὐπόρως (ω): εὐπόνως Φ
 καὶ κατὰστησον σύ με Φ
 (ω) 887 οἴσουσιν οἶδε Φ
 ἀντέχου (ω): λαμβάνου Φ
 891 δῆτα (ω) γε (ω): λέγε Φ
 901 ἔπαισεν Φ: ἔπεισεν (ω)

871 με Φ 872 εὐφώρως Brunck (pr. Valcke-
 873 ἀγαθοὶ eds.: οἱ ἄγαθοι Φ: ἀγαθοὶ (ω) 879
 880 κόπου ἀπαλλαχθῶμεν Φ 884 σου Φ: σοι
 888 οὕτως Φ δ' Φ 893 ἔστω Φ
 894 μ' ἔθος (ω): μέ πως Φ 895 δῆτ' (ἂν) Schae-
 896 λόγων Φ 897 ὅππῃ Φ: ὅποι (ω)
 902 αὐτοῦ Φ: αὐτοῦ (ω)

- 905
 910
 915
 920
 925
 930
 935
- 906
 913
 924
 933
- 907
 916
 926
 936
- 909
 917
 928
- 910
 911
 923
 928
 934
- 934

906 πάλιν Φ: πολλά Φ 907 γε Φ: δὲ Φ: τε ω 909 ἔπη Φ 910
 909 eds.: ἀνὴρ ω 910 μη γὰρ Φ: μὲν γὰρ Φ: καὶ γὰρ Φ 911 ἔοικεν Φ
 913 πέμπτων Φ πάλιν Φ 916 τῶν Φ 917 τί σ' εἶπω Φ 923
 924 τὰ omitted Φ 926 πο(ι)εῖ ω: ποεῖν Φ 928 εἰργα-
 933 με μή ἀφέλῃ Elmsley: μή μου ἀφέλῃς Φ: μή μ' ἀφέλῃς ω 934
 936 ξυνουσία Β

- θηρῶν ὀρείων, ὦ καταρρῶγες πέτραι,
 ὑμῖν τάδ', οὐ γὰρ ἄλλον οἶδ' ὅτ' ἄγω,
 ἀνακλαίωμα παροῦσι τοῖς εἰωθόσιν,
 οἶ' ἔργ' ὁ παῖς μ' ἔδρασεν οὐς Ἀχιλλέως· 940
 ὁμόσας ἀπάξειν οἴκαδ', ἐς Τροίαν μ' ἄγει·
 προσθεῖς τε χεῖρα δεξιάν, τὰ τόξα μου
 ἱερὰ λαβὼν τοῦ Ζηνὸς Ἡρακλέους ἔχει,
 καὶ τοῖσιν Ἀργείοισι φήνασθαι θέλει.
 ὥς ἄνδρ' ἑλὼν ἰσχυρὸν ἐκ βίας μ' ἄγει, 945
 κοῦκ οἶδ' ἐναίρων νεκρόν, ἧ καπνοῦ σκιάν,
 εἶδωλον ἄλλως. οὐ γὰρ ἄν σθένοντά γε
 εἶλέν μ'· ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἄν ὦδ' ἔχοντ', εἰ μὴ δόλωι.
 νῦν δ' ἠπάτημαι δύσμορος. τί χρή με δρᾶν;
 (ἄλλ') ἀπόδος· ἀλλὰ νῦν ἔτ' ἐν σαυτῶι γενοῦ. 950
 τί φῆις; σιωπαῖς· οὐδέν εἰμ' ὁ δύσμορος.
 ὦ σχῆμα πέτρας δίπυλον, αὐθις αὖ πάλιν
 εἴσειμι πρὸς σέ ψιλός, οὐκ ἔχων τροφήν·
 ἀλλ' αὐανοῦμαι τῶιδ' ἐν αὐλίωι μόνος,
 οὐ πτηνὸν ὄρνιν, οὐδὲ θῆρ' ὀρειβάτην 955
 τόξοις ἐναίρων τοισίδ', ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τάλας
 θανὼν παρέξω δαῖτ' ὑφ' ὧν ἐφερβρόμην,
 καὶ μ' οὐς ἐθήρων πρόσθε θηράσουσι νῦν·
 φόνον φόνου δὲ ῥύσιον τείσω τάλας
 πρὸς τοῦ δοκοῦντος οὐδὲν εἶδέναι κακόν. 960
 ὄλοιο – μήπω, πρὶν μάθοιμ' εἰ καὶ πάλιν
 γνῶμην μετοίσεις· εἰ δὲ μή, θάνοις κακῶς.
- Χο. τί δρῶμεν; ἐν σοὶ καὶ τὸ πλεῖν ἡμᾶς, ἄναξ,
 ἦδη 'στὶ καὶ τοῖς τοῦδε προσχωρεῖν λόγοις.
- Νε. ἐμοὶ μὲν οἶκτος δεινὸς ἐμπέπτωκέ τις 965
 τοῦδ' ἄνδρὸς οὐ νῦν πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλαι.
- Φι. ἐλέησον, ὦ παῖ, πρὸς θεῶν, καὶ μὴ παρῆις
 σαυτοῦ βροτοῖς ὄνειδος ἐκκλέψας ἐμέ.
- Νε. οἴμοι, τί δράσω; μήποτ' ὦφελον λιπτεῖν

941 μ' inserted after ἀπάξειν Φ μ' omitted before ἄγει Φ 942 προθεῖς
 Φ δὲ Φ 945 ἑλὼν ΦΒ: ἑλὼν μ' ὦ μ' ἄγει ΦΒ: ἄγει ὠΒ 946
 οὐκ Β οἶδεν αἰρών ΦΒ 949 με δρᾶν ὠ: ποιεῖν ΦΒ 950 (ἄλλ') ἀπό-
 dos Turnebus: ἀπόδος σύ γ' Φ: ἀπόδος ὠ σαυτοῦ Φ 951 σιωπαῖς Φ:
 σιωπαῖς; ὠ 952 αὖ omitted Φ 954 αὐανοῦμαι ΦΣ: αὖ θανοῦμαι ὠΒ
 956 τοισίδ' Φ: τοῖσδε Φ: τοῖς δέ γ' Φ 957 ἀφ' Wunder 966 καὶ πάλιν
 Φ: πολλακίς Φ 967 παρῆι Φ 968 σαυτὸν Φ

- τὴν Σκυῖρον· οὕτω τοῖς παροῦσιν ἄχθομαι. 970
- Φι. οὐκ εἴ κακὸς σύ, πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν μαθὼν
 ἔοικας ἥκειν αἰσχροῖ· νῦν δ' ἄλλοισι δοῦς
 οἷς εἰκός, ἔκπλει, τὰμ' ἐμοὶ μεθεῖς ὅπλα.
- Νε. τί δρῶμεν, ἄνδρες; Οδ. ὦ κάκιστ' ἀνδρῶν, τί δρᾷς;
 οὐκ εἴ, μεθεῖς τὰ τόξα ταῦτ' ἐμοί, πάλιν; 975
- Φι. οἶμοι, τίς ἀνὴρ; ἄρ' Ὀδυσσέως κλύω;
 Οδ. Ὀδυσσέως, σάφ' ἴσθ', ἐμοῦ γ', ὃν εἰσορᾷς.
 Φι. οἶμοι· πέπραμαι κάπόλῳλ'· ὅδ' ἦν ἄρα
 ὁ ξυλλαβῶν με κάπονοσφίσας ὅπλων.
- Οδ. ἐγώ, σάφ' ἴσθ', οὐκ ἄλλος· ὁμολογῶ τάδε. 980
 Φι. ἀπόδος, ἄφες μοι, παῖ, τὰ τόξα. Οδ. τοῦτο μὲν,
 οὐδ' ἦν θέληι, δράσει ποτ'· ἀλλὰ καὶ σέ δεῖ
 στεῖχειν ἅμ' αὐτοῖς, ἢ βίαι στελοῦσί σε.
- Φι. ξμ', ὦ κακῶν κάκιστε καὶ τολμήστατε,
 οἶδ' ἐκ βίας ἄξουσιν; Οδ. ἦν μὴ ῥηπῆς ἐκὼν. 985
- Φι. ὦ Λημνία χθὼν καὶ τὸ παγκρατὲς σέλας
 Ἥφαιστότευκτον, ταῦτα διῆτ' ἀνασχετά,
 εἴ μ' οὗτος ἐκ τῶν σῶν ἀπάσσεται βίαι;
- Οδ. Ζεὺς ἐσθ', ἴν' εἰδῆις, Ζεὺς, ὁ τῆσδε γῆς κρατῶν,
 Ζεὺς, ᾧ δέδοκται ταῦθ'· ὑπηρετῶ δ' ἐγώ. 990
- Φι. ὦ μῖσος, οἷα κάξανευρίσκεις λέγειν·
 θεοὺς προτείνων τοὺς θεοὺς ψευδεῖς τίθης.
- Οδ. οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἀληθεῖς. ἢ δ' ὁδὸς πορευτέα.
- Φι. οὐ φημ'. Οδ. ἐγὼ δὲ φημί. πειστέον τάδε.
- Φι. οἶμοι τάλας. ἡμᾶς μὲν ὥς δούλους σαφῶς
 πατὴρ ἄρ' ἐξέφυσεν οὐδ' ἐλευθέρους. 995
- Οδ. οὐκ, ἀλλ' ὁμοίους τοῖς ἀρίστοισιν, μεθ' ὧν
 Τροίαν σ' ἐλεῖν δεῖ καὶ κατασκάψαι βίαι.
- Φι. οὐδέποτε γ'· οὐδ' ἦν χρῆι με πᾶν παθεῖν κακόν,
 ἕως γ' ἂν ἦι μοι γῆς τόδ' αἰπαινὸν βάθρον. 1000
- Οδ. τί δ' ἐργασείεις; Φι. κρᾶτ' ἐμὸν τόδ' αὐτίκα
 πέτραι πέτρας ἄνωθεν αἰμάξω πεσών.

971 δ' omitted Φ 973 τὰμ' ἐμοί Platt: τὰμά μοι ὦ 976 ἀνὴρ Brunck:
 ἀνὴρ ὦ 977 ἱστορεῖς Φ 984 τολμηέστατε Φ: τολμίστατε Φ 990
 Ζεὺς δ' ὦι Φ 992 τίθης Auratus: τίθεις or τίθεις ὦ 994 Φι. οὐ φημ'. Οδ.
 ἐγὼ δὲ φημί Gernhard (pr. Markland): Φι. οὐ φημ' ἐγωγε. Οδ. φημί ὦ 999 οὐ δὴ
 ποτ' Φ χρῆι Brunck: χρῆ Φ: χρῆ ὦ γε Φ μαθεῖν Φ 1000 ἕως
 γ' ἂν Φ: ἕως δ' ἂν Φ: ἕως ἂν ὦ 1001 ἐργάσεις Φ

Οδ. ξυλλάβετον αὐτόν· μή 'πὶ τῷιδ' ἔστω τάδε.

- Φι. ὦ χεῖρες, οἷα πάσχετ' ἐν χρεαῖα φίλης
 νευρᾶς, ὕπ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε συνθηρώμεναι. 1005
 ὦ μηδὲν ὑγιᾶς μηδ' ἐλεύθερον φρονῶν,
 οἷ' αὖ μ' ὑπῆλθες, ὥς μ' ἐθηράσω, λαβὼν
 πρόβλημα σαυτοῦ παῖδα τόνδ' ἀγνώτ' ἐμοί,
 ἀνάξιον μὲν σοῦ, κατάξιον δ' ἐμοῦ,
 δς οὐδὲν ἥιδει πλὴν τὸ προσταχθὲν ποεῖν, 1010
 δῆλος δὲ καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ἀλγεινῶς φέρων
 οἷς τ' αὐτὸς ἐξήμαρτεν οἷς τ' ἐγὼ 'παθον.
 ἀλλ' ἡ κακὴ σὴ διὰ μυχῶν βλέπουσ' ἀεὶ
 ψυχὴ νιν ἀφυᾶ τ' ὄντα κού θέλονθ' ὁμως
 εὖ προϋδίδασξεν ἐν κακοῖς εἶναι σοφόν. 1015
 καὶ νῦν ξμ', ὦ δύστηνε, συνδήσας νοεῖς
 ἄγειν ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τῆσδ', ἐν ἧ με προὔβάλου
 ἄφιλον, ἔρημον, ἄπολιν, ἐν ζῶσιν νεκρόν.
 φεῦ.
 ὀλοιο· καίτοι πολλάκις τόδ' ηὔξάμην.
 ἀλλ', οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲν θεοὶ νέμουσιν ἡδύ μοι, 1020
 σὺ μὲν γέγηθας ζῶν, ἐγὼ δ' ἀλγύνομαι
 τοῦτ' αὐθ', ὅτι ζῶ σὺν κακοῖς πολλοῖς τάλας,
 γελῶμενος πρὸς σοῦ τε καὶ τῶν Ἀτρώως
 διπλῶν στρατηγῶν, οἷς σὺ ταῦθ' ὑπηρετεῖς.
 καίτοι σὺ μὲν κλοπῇ τε κἀνάγκῃ ζυγεῖς 1025
 ἔπλεις ἅμ' αὐτοῖς, ἐμὲ δὲ τὸν πανάθλιον,
 ἐκόντα πλεύσανθ' ἐπτά ναυσὶ ναυβάτην,
 ἄτιμον ἔβαλον, ὥς σὺ φῆις, κεῖνοι δὲ σέ.
 καὶ νῦν τί μ' ἄγετε; τί μ' ἀπάγεσθε; τοῦ χάριν;
 δς οὐδὲν εἰμι καὶ τέθνηχ' ὑμῖν πάλαι. 1030
 πῶς, ὦ θεοῖς ἔχθιστε, νῦν οὐκ εἰμί σοι
 χωλός, δυσώδης; πῶς θεοῖς ἔξεστ', ἐμοῦ
 πλεύσαντος, αἰθεῖν ἱερά, πῶς σπένδειν ἔτι;
 αὕτη γὰρ ἦν σοι πρόφασις ἐκβαλεῖν ἐμέ.

1003 ξυλλάβετον Bernhardt: -λάβετέ γ' Φ: -λάβετ' ω 1007 οἷ' αὖ Hermann:
 οἷον Φ: οἷός Τ: οἷά ω δς Φ 1010 ποεῖν Φ: πονεῖν Φ: ποιεῖν ωB 1012
 first τ' omitted Φ 'παθον eds.: πάθον ω 1014 ἀφυᾶ L. Dindorf: ἀφυῆ ω
 1016 ἐμ' ω: σὺ μ' ΦΣ: δέ μ' Τ 1017 ἄγειν μ' ἀπ' Φ 1018 ἔρημον omitted
 Φ: after ἄπολιν Φ 1019 φεῦ omitted Φ καίτοι Wakefield: καὶ σοι ω: καὶ σὺ
 Φ ηὔξάμην Φ: εὗξ- ω 1023 τε Φ: γε ω 1024 δισσων Φ 1025
 κἀπάττῃ Φ ῥαγεῖς Φ 1028 ἔβαλον Φ: ἔβαλλον Φ: ἐξέβαλον Φ 1032
 ἔξεστ' Pierson after Σ: εὗξεσθ' ω ὁμοῦ Φ

- κακῶς ὀλοισθ'· ὀλεῖσθε δ' ἡδίκηκότες 1035
 τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε, θεοῖσιν εἰ δίκης μέλει.
 ἔξοιδα δ' ὥς μέλει γ'· ἐπεὶ οὔποτ' ἂν στόλον
 ἐπλεύσατ' ἂν τόνδ' οὔνεκ' ἄνδρὸς ἀθλίου,
 εἰ μὴ τι κέντρον θεῖον ἦγ' ὑμᾶς ἔμοῦ.
 ἄλλ', ὦ πατρώια γῆ θεοὶ τ' ἐπόψιοι, 1040
 τείσασθε, τείσασθ' ἄλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ ποτὲ
 ξύμπαντας αὐτούς, εἴ τι κᾶμ' οἰκτίρετε·
 ὥς ζῶ μὲν οἰκτρῶς, εἰ δ' ἴδοιμ' ὀλωλότας
 τούτους, δοκοῖμ' ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγένοι.
 Χο. βαρὺς τε καὶ βαρεῖαν ὁ ξένος φάτιν 1045
 τήνδ' εἶπ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, κούχ ὑπέικουσιν κακοῖς.
 Οδ. πόλλ' ἂν λέγειν ἔχοιμι πρὸς τὰ τοῦδ' ἔπη,
 εἴ μοι παρεῖκοι· νῦν δ' ἐνὸς κρατῷ λόγον.
 οὔ γάρ τοιούτων δεῖ, τοιούτός εἰμ' ἐγώ·
 χῶπου δικαίων κάγαθῶν ἄνδρων κρίσις, 1050
 οὐκ ἂν λάβοις μου μᾶλλον οὐδέν' εὐσεβῆ.
 νικᾶν γε μέντοι πανταχοῦ χρήζων ἔφυν,
 πλὴν εἰς σέ· νῦν δὲ σοὶ γ' ἐκὼν ἐκστήσομαι.
 ἄφετε γὰρ αὐτόν, μηδὲ προσψάυσητ' ἔτι.
 ἔατε μίμνειν. οὐδὲ σοῦ προσχρήζομεν, 1055
 τά γ' ὀπλ' ἔχοντες ταῦτ'· ἐπεὶ πάρεστι μὲν
 Τεῦκρος παρ' ἡμῖν, τήνδ' ἐπιστήμην ἔχων,
 ἐγώ θ', ὃς οἶμαι σοῦ κάκιον οὐδὲν ἂν
 τούτων κρατύνειν, μηδ' ἐπιθύνειν χερί.
 τί δῆτα σοῦ δεῖ; χαῖρε τὴν Λῆμνον πατῶν. 1060
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἴωμεν· καὶ τάχ' ἂν τὸ σὸν γέρας
 τιμὴν ἐμοὶ νείμειεν, ἣν σέ χρῆν ἔχειν.
 Φι. οἶμοι· τί δράσω δύσμορος; σὺ τοῖς ἐμοῖς
 ὀπλοισι κοσμηθεὶς ἐν Ἀργείοις φανῇ;
 Οδ. μὴ μ' ἀντιφώνει μηδέν, ὥς στείχοντα δῆ. 1065
 Φι. ὦ σπέρμ' Ἀχιλλέως, οὐδὲ σοῦ φωνῆς ἔτι
 γενήσομαι προσφθεγκτός, ἀλλ' οὔτως ἄπει;
 Οδ. χώρει σύ· μὴ πρόσλευσσε, γενναῖός περ ὦν,
 ἡμῶν ὅπως μὴ τὴν τύχην διαφθερεῖς.

1035 ὀλεῖσθε Brunck (pr. Markland): ὀλοισθε ω 1037 δ' ὥς ΦΤ: γ' ὥς Φ: ὥς Φ
 1048 παρήκοι Φ 1051 μου omitted Φ: με σὺ Φ 1052 κρείσσων or κρείτ-
 των Φ 1054 προσψάυσητέ τι Φ: -ετ' ἔτι Φ 1055 σου Φ 1062 σέ
 χρῆν Ellendt: ἐχρῆν σ' Φ: σ' ἐχρῆν ω 1069 ἡμῶν γ' Φ διαφθαρήις Φ: -αρείς
 Φ

- Φι. ἦ καὶ πρὸς ὑμῶν ὧδ' ἔρημος, ὧ ξένοι,
 λειφθήσομαι δὴ κοῦκ ἐπιοικτιρεῖτέ με;
 Χο. ὃδ' ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ναυκράτωρ ὁ παῖς· ὅσ' ἂν
 οὔτος λέγῃ σοι, ταῦτά σοι χήμεῖς φαμεν.
 Νε. ἀκούσομαι μὲν ὡς ἔφυν οἴκτου πλέως
 πρὸς τοῦδ'· ὅμως δὲ μέινат', εἰ τούτῳ δοκεῖ,
 χρόνον τοσοῦτον εἰς ὅσον τά τ' ἐκ νεῶς
 στείλωσι ναῦται καὶ θεοῖς εὐξώμεθα.
 χοῦτος τάχ' ἂν φρόνησιν ἐν τούτῳ λάβοι
 λῶιω τιν' ἡμῖν. νῶ μὲν οὖν ὀρμώμεθον,
 ὑμεῖς δ', ὅταν καλῶμεν, ὀρμᾶσθαι ταχεῖς.
 1070
- Φι. ὦ κοίλας πέτρας γύαλον
 θερμὸν καὶ παγετώδες, ὧς
 σ' οὐκ ἔμελλον ἄρ', ὦ τάλας,
 λείψειν οὐδέποτ', ἀλλὰ μοι
 καὶ θνήσκοντι συνείσηι.
 1075
 ὦμοι μοί μοι.
 ὦ πληρέστατον αὔλιον
 λύπας τᾶς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τάλαν,
 τίπτ' αὖ μοι τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ ἔσται;
 τοῦ ποτε τεύξομαι
 1080
 σιτονόμου μέλεος πόθεν ἐλπίδος;
 ἴθ' αἰ πρόσθ' ἄνω
 πτωκάδες ὀξυτόνου διὰ πνεύματος·
 ἄλωσιν οὐκέτ' ἴσχω.
 Χο. σύ τοι, σύ τοι κατηξίω-
 1085
 σας, ὦ βαρύποτμε, κοῦκ
 ἄλλοθεν ἅ τύχα ἄδ' ἀπὸ μείζονος,
 εὔτε γε παρὸν φρονῆσαι
 λῶϊονος δαίμονος εἴ-
 λου τὸ κάκιον αἰνεῖν.
 1090

1071 λειφθήσομαι δὴ Wakefield (pr. Markland): λειφθήσομ' ἦδη ὡ 1078 χ' οὕτως
 Φ 1079 ὀρμώμεθα Φ 1080 ὀρμᾶσθε Φ 1082 θερμὸν T: θερμόν τε
 ὡ 1083 ὦ Blaydes: ὦ Φ: ὦ or ὁ ὡ 1085 συνείσηι Reiske: συνοίσηι ὡ
 1086 οἶμοι Φ 1089 τίπτ' Musgrave: τί ποτ' ὡ 1092 ἴθ' Hermann: εἴθ' ὡ
 αἰ πρόσθ' Hermann: αἰθέρος ὡ 1093 πτωχάδες ΣΤ 1094 ἄλωσιν Jeep:
 ἔλωσί μ' ὡ: ἔλωσί μ' Φ: ἔλωσιν Erfurdt οὐκέτ' ἴσχω Dissen: οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἴσχύω ὡ
 1095 σύ τοι σύ τοι ὡ: σύ τοι Φ 1096 κοῦκ Φ: οὐκ ὡ 1097 ἅ τύχα δδ'
 Dindorf: ἔχηι τύχα τᾶιδ' ὡ 1098 γε ὡ: γὰρ Φ 1099 λῶϊονος Bothe: τοῦ
 λῶιονος ὡ 1100 αἰνεῖν Hermann: ἐλεῖν ὡ

- Φι. ὦ τλάμων τλάμων ἄρ' ἐγὼ
καὶ μόχθῳ λωβατός, δις ἤ-
δη μετ' οὐδενὸς ὕστερον
ἀνδρῶν εἰσοπίσω τάλας
ναίων ἐνθάδ' ὀλοῦμαι,
αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,
οὐ φορβάν ἔτι προσφέρων,
οὐ πτανῶν ἀπ' ἐμῶν ὀπλων
κραταιαῖς μετὰ χερσὶν ἴσχων·
ἀλλὰ μοι ἄσκοπα
κρυπτά τ' ἔπη δολερᾶς ὑπέδου φρενός·
ἰδοίμαν δέ νιν,
τὸν τάδε μηςάμενον, τὸν ἴσον χρόνον
ἐμὰς λαχόντ' ἀνίας.
Χο. πότμος, (πότμος) σε δαιμόνων
τάδ', οὐδὲ σέ γε δόλος
ἔσχ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἐμᾶς· στυγεράν ἔχε
δύσποτμον ἄράν ἐπ' ἄλλοις.
καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοῦτο μέλει,
μὴ φιλότῃτ' ἀπώσῃ.
Φι. οἴμοι μοι, καὶ πού πολιᾶς
πόντου θινὸς ἐφήμενος,
γελαῖ μου, χερὶ πάλλων
τὰν ἐμὰν μελέου τροφάν,
τὰν οὐδεὶς ποτ' ἐβάστασεν.
ὦ τόξον φίλον, ὦ φίλων
χειρῶν ἐκβεβιασμένον,
ἦ πού ἐλαινὸν ὀρᾶς, φρένας εἴ τινας
ἔχεις, τὸν Ἡράκλειον
ἄθλιον ὧδέ σοι
οὐκέτι χρησόμενον τὸ μεθύστερον
ἄλλου δ' ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ
πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρὸς ἐρέσσει,
ὀρῶν μὲν αἰσχροῦς ἀπάτας,

1101 τλήμον τλήμον or τλάμον τλάμον Φ 1109 πτανὸν Φ 1111 ἀγοφα
ΣΤ 1115 ἐμὰς Φ: ἐμᾶς ὦ 1116 πότμος πότμος Erfurdt: πότμος ὦ
1117 γε omitted Φ 1120 ἄράν Φ: ἄράν ἄράν ὦ 1125 χερὶ Φ: χερὶ ὦ
1130 ἐλαινὸν Brunck: ἐλεεινὸν ὦ 1132 ἄθλιον Φ: ἄθλον ὦ 1134 ἄλλου δ'
Hermann: ἄλλ' ὦ

- στυγνόν τε φῶτ' ἔχθοδοπόν,
 μυρί' ἅπ' αἰσχυρῶν ἀνατέλ-
 λονθ' ὅσ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν κάκ' ἐμήσατ' Ἰὼδυσσεύς†.
 Χο. ἀνδρός τοι τὸ μὲν ὄν δίκαιον εἴπεῖν,
 εἰπόντος δὲ μὴ φθονεράν
 ἐξῶσαι γλώσσας ὀδύναν.
 κείνος δ' εἷς ἀπὸ πολλῶν
 ταχθεὶς τοῦδ' ἐφημοσύνην
 κοινὰν ἤνυσεν ἐς φίλους ἄρωγάν.
 1140
 1145
 Φι. ὦ πταναὶ θῆραι χαροπῶν τ'
 ἔθνη θηρῶν, οὓς ὁδ' ἔχει
 χῶρος οὐρεσιβώτας,
 φυγαῖ μηκέτ' ἅπ' αὐλίῳ
 ἐλᾷτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔχω χεροῖν
 τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκάν,
 ὦ δύστανος ἐγὼ τανῦν·
 ἀλλ' ἀνέδην ὁδε χῶρος ἐρύκεται
 οὐκέτι φοβητὸς ὑμῖν,
 ἔρπετε, νῦν καλὸν
 ἀντίφονον κορέσαι στόμα πρὸς χάριν
 ἐμᾶς σαρκὸς αἰόλας·
 ἀπὸ γὰρ βίον αὐτίκα λείψω.
 πόθεν γὰρ ἔσται βιοτά;
 τίς ὦδ' ἐν αὖραις τρέφεται,
 1150
 1155
 1160
 μηκέτι μηδενὸς κρατύ-
 νων ὅσα πέμπει βιόδωρος αἶα;
 Χο. πρὸς θεῶν, εἴ τι σέβῃ ξένον, πέλασσον
 εὐνοίαι πάσαι πελάταν·
 ἀλλὰ γνῶθ', εὖ γνῶθ', ἐπὶ σοὶ
 κῆρα τάνδ' ἀποφεύγειν·
 οἰκτρὰ γὰρ βόσκειν, ἀδαῆς δ'
 ἔχειν μυρίον ἄχθος ὦι ξυνοικεῖ.

1138 ὅσ' Φ 1140 ὄν Kells: εὖ ὦ 1144 ἐφημοσύνην Φ: ὑφ- Φ: εὐφ-ν Τ
 1146 πταναὶ Φ: πτηναὶ ὦ: πτηνοὶ Φ 1148 οὐρεσιβώτας Φ: ὀρεσιβώτας (or
 -βάτας) Φ 1149 μηκέτ' Auratus: μ' οὐκέτ' ὦ 1150 ἐλᾷτ' Canter: πελᾷτ'
 ὦ 1151 πρόσθεν Φ: πρόσθε ὦ 1153 ἀναίδην Φ 1156 κορέσαι τε Φ
 1157 ἐμᾶς ὦ: τᾶσδ' (with αἰόλας σαρκὸς) Τ 1163 πέλασσον Φ 1165 ἐπὶ σοὶ
 Seyffert: ὅτι σοὶ ὦ 1166 ἀποφυγεῖν ΦΣΤ 1168 ὀχεῖν ΦΣ ὦι Φ: δ
 ὦ

amoiβαion

- Φι. πάλιν, πάλιν παλαιὸν ἄλ-
 γημ' ὑπέμνασας, ὦ
 λῶιστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων.
 τί μ' ὠλεσας; τί μ' εἵργασαι;
- Χο. τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; Φι. εἰ σὺ τὰν [ἐμοί]
 στυγερὰν Τρωιάδα γὰρ μ' ἠλπισας ἄξειν.
- Χο. τόδε γὰρ νοῶ κράτιστον.
 Φι. ἀπὸ νῦν με λείπετ' ἥδη.
- Χο. φίλα μοι, φίλα ταῦτα παρήγγει-
 λας ἐκόντι τε πράσσειν.
 ἴωμεν, ἴωμεν
 ναὸς ἱν' ἡμῖν τέτακται.
- Φι. μή, πρὸς ἀραίου Διός, ἔλ-
 θης, ἱκετεύω. Χο. μετρίαζ'. Φι. ὦ ξένοι,
 μέινατε, πρὸς θεῶν. Χο. τί θροεῖς;
- Φι. αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,
 δαίμων δαίμων· ἀπόλωλ' ὁ τάλας·
 ὦ πούς, πούς, τί σ' ἔτ' ἐν βίῳ
 τεύξω τῷ μετόπιν, τάλας;
 ὦ ξένοι, ἔλθετ' ἐπήλυδες αὖθις.
- Χο. τί ῥέξοντες; ἀλλόκοτος
 γνῶμα τῶν πάρος ἂν προφαίνεις.
- Φι. οὔτοι νεμεσητὸν
 ἀλύοντα χειμερίῳ
 λύπαι καὶ παρὰ νοῦν θροεῖν.
- Χο. βᾶθι νυν, ὦ τάλαν, ὥς σε κελεύομεν.
- Φι. οὐδέποτ', οὐδέποτ' ἴσθι τόδ' ἔμπεδον,
 οὐδ' εἰ πυρφόρος ἀστεροπητῆς
 βροντᾶς αὐγαῖς μ' εἴσι φλογίζων.
 ἐρρέτω Ἴλιον, οἳ θ' ὑπ' ἐκείνῳ
 πάντες ὅσοι τόδ' ἔτλασεν ἐμοῦ ποδὸς
 ἄρθρον ἀπῶσαι.
 [ἀλλ'] ὦ ξένοι, ἐν γέ μοι εὖχος ὀρέξατε.
- Χο. ποῖον ἐρεῖς τόδ' ἔπος; Φι. ξίφος, εἴ ποθεν,

1170 ὑπέμνασας μ' Τ 1173-4 [ἐμοί] deleted by Hartung 1175 γὰρ Φ
 μ' ἠλπισας Φ: ἠλπισάς μ' ὦ 1180 ἴωμεν ἴωμεν Φ 1182 ἱκετεύω σε Φ
 1187 δαίμον δαίμον Φ 1189 τῷ ΦΤ: τὸ ὦ 1191-2 ῥέξοντες; Page: ῥέξ-
 οντες ὦ ἀλλόκοτος γνῶμα ... ἂν Page: ἀλλοκότῳ γνῶμαι ... ὦν ὦ 1192
 προφαίνεις Pearson: προῦφαινεις ὦ: προῦφανες Φ 1196 ὥς σε ὦ: ὅπου Φ
 1199 βροντᾶς Σ: βρονταῖς Φ αὐγαῖς Σ: αὐταῖς ὦ 1200 ἐπ' Φ ἐκείνῳ
 Φ 1203 [ἀλλ'] Erfurdt

- ἢ γένυν ἢ βελέων τι, προπέμψατε. 1205
- Χο. ὥς τίνα (δὴ) ῥέξης παλάμαν ποτέ;
- Φι. κρᾶτ' ἀπὸ πάντα καὶ ἄρθρα τέμω χερσί·
φονᾶι, φονᾶι νόος ἤδη.
- Χο. τί ποτε; Φι. πατέρα ματεύων 1210
- Χο. ποῖ γὰρ; Φι. ἐς Αἰδου.
οὐ γὰρ ἐν φάει γ' ἔτι.
ὦ πόλις, [ὦ] πόλις πατρία
πῶς ἂν εἰσίδοιμί σ' ἄθλιός γ' ἀνὴρ,
ὅς γε σὰν λιπὼν ἱερὰν 1215
λιβάδ' ἔβαν ἐχθροῖς Δαναοῖς
ἄρωγός· ἔτ' οὐδὲν εἰμι.
- Χο. ἐγὼ μὲν ἤδη καὶ πάλαι νεὼς ὁμοῦ
στείχων ἂν ἢ σοι τῆς ἐμῆς, εἰ μὴ πέλας
Ὀδυσσέα στείχοντα τόν τ' Ἀχιλλέως 1220
γόνον πρὸς ἡμᾶς δεῦρ' ἰόντ' ἐλεύσσομεν.
- Οδ. οὐκ ἂν φράσειας ἦντιν' αὐτὸν παλίντροπος
κέλευθον ἔρπεις ὧδε σὺν σπουδῇ ταχύς;
- Νε. λύσων ὅσ' ἐξήμαρτον ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ.
- Οδ. δεινόν γε φωνεῖς· ἢ δ' ἄμαρτία τίς ἦν; 1225
- Νε. ἦν σοὶ πιθόμενος τῷ τε σύμπαντι στρατῷ –
- Οδ. ἔπραξας ἔργον ποῖον ὦν οὐ σοι πρέπον;
- Νε. ἀπάταισιν αἰσχροῖς ἄνδρα καὶ δόλοισι ἔλων.
- Οδ. τὸν ποῖον; ὦμοι· μὴν τι βουλευῇ νέον;
- Νε. νέον μὲν οὐδέν, τῷ δὲ Ποίαντος τόκῳ – 1230
- Οδ. τί χρῆμα δράσεις; ὥς μ' ὑπῆλθέ τις φόβος.
- Νε. παρ' οὐπερ ἔλαβον τάδε τὰ τόξ', αὐθις πάλιν –
- Οδ. ὦ Ζεῦ, τί λέξεις; οὐ τί που δοῦναι νοεῖς;
- Νε. αἰσchrῶς γὰρ αὐτὰ κοῦ δίκῃ λαβὼν ἔχω.
- Οδ. πρὸς θεῶν, πότερα δὴ κερτομῶν λέγεις τάδε; 1235
- Νε. εἰ κερτόμησίς ἐστι τάλῃθ' ἴδ' ἔστιν.
- Οδ. τί φῆς, Ἀχιλλέως παῖ; τίν' εἴρηκας λόγον;

1206 (δὴ) Hermann ῥέξεις Φ: ῥέξεις T: ἀράξης Φ 1207 χρῶτ' Hermann 1209 νόσος Φ 1210 ματεύων Φ: μαστεύων ὦ 1212 γὰρ Hermann: γὰρ ἔστ' ὦ: γὰρ ἔτ' Φ 1213 [ὦ] deleted by Gleditsch 1216 ἔβαν ἐχθροῖς Buijs: ἐχθροῖς ἔβαν ὦ 1218–21 ἐγὼ... ἐλεύσσομεν deleted by Meckler 1218 ἐγγύς Φ 1219 ἢ Elmsley: ἦν ὦ 1222 οὐδ' Φ 1226 πιθόμενος Φ: πεθόμενος ὦ: γε πεθόμενος ΦΤ 1231 τί χρῆμα τί Φ 1232 παρ' οὐ παρέλαβον Φ τὰ Φ: omitted ὦ 1233 ἦ Φ 1235 δὴ Φ: omitted ὦ

- Νε. δις ταῦτ' ἀ βούλῃ καὶ τρεῖς ἀναπολεῖν μ' ἔπη;
 Οδ. ἀρχὴν κλύειν ἂν οὐδ' ἄπας ἐβουλόμην.
 Νε. εὖ νυν ἐπίστω πάντ' ἀκηκοῶς λόγον. 1240
 Οδ. ἔστιν τις, ἔστιν ὅς σε κωλύσει τὸ δρᾶν.
 Νε. τί φής; τίς ἔσται μ' οὐπικωλύσων τάδε;
 Οδ. ζύμπας Ἀχαιῶν λαός, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐγώ.
 Νε. σοφὸς πεφυκῶς οὐδὲν ἐξαυδαῖς σοφόν.
 Οδ. σὺ δ' οὔτε φωνεῖς οὔτε δρασεῖεις σοφόν. 1245
 Νε. ἀλλ' εἰ δίκαια, τῶν σοφῶν κρεῖσσω τάδε.
 Οδ. καὶ πῶς δίκαιον, ἃ γ' ἔλαβες βουλαῖς ἐμαῖς,
 πάλιν μεθεῖναι ταῦτα; Νε. τὴν ἀμαρτίαν
 αἰσχρὰν ἀμαρτῶν ἀναλαβεῖν πειράσομαι.
 Οδ. στρατὸν δ' Ἀχαιῶν οὐ φοβῆι, πράσσων τάδε; 1250
 Νε. ζὺν τῷ δικαίῳ τὸν σὸν οὐ ταρβῶ (στρατόν. 1251a
 Οδ.) φόβον. 1251b
 Νε. ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοι σῆι χειρὶ πείθομαι τὸ δρᾶν.
 Οδ. οὐ τᾶρα Τρωσίν, ἀλλὰ σοὶ μαχοῦμεθα.
 Νε. ἔστω τὸ μέλλον. Οδ. χεῖρα δεξιὰν ὀρᾷς
 κώπης ἐπιψαύουσαν; Νε. ἀλλὰ κάμει τοι 1255
 ταῦτόν τόδ' ὄψῃ δρῶντα κοῦ μέλλοντ' ἔτι.
 Οδ. καίτοι σ' ἑάσω· τῷ δὲ σύμπαντι στρατῷ
 λέξω τάδ' ἐλθὼν, ὅς σε τιμωρήσεται.
 Νε. ἔσωφρόνησας· κἂν τὰ λοιπ' οὕτω φρονῆις,
 ἴσως ἂν ἐκτὸς κλαυμάτων ἔχοις πόδα. 1260
 σὺ δ', ὦ Ποίαντος παῖ, Φιλοκτῆτην λέγω,
 ἔξελθ' ἀμείψας τάσδε πετρήρεις στέγας.
 Φι. τίς αὖ παρ' ἀντροῖς θόρυβος ἵσταται βοῆς;
 τί μ' ἐκκαλεῖσθε; τοῦ κεκρημένοι, ξένοι;
 ὦμοι· κακὸν τὸ χρῆμα. μὲν τί μοι μέγα 1265
 πάρεστε πρὸς κακοῖσι πέμποντες κακόν;
 Νε. θάρσει· λόγους δ' ἀκουσον οὕς ἤκω φέρων.
 Φι. δέδοικ' ἔγωγε. καὶ τὰ πρὶν γὰρ ἐκ λόγων

1238 ταῦτ' Φ: ταῦτα ὦ 1240 ἐπίστω· Φ ἀκηκοῶς Φ: ἀκήκοας ὦ
 1243 τοῖς Φ: τοῖσδ' ὦ 1245 σοφόν ὦ: σοφά Brunck 1251a στρατόν
 Hermann (who suggested that a line is missing between 1251 and 1252): φόβον ὦ (moved
 by Jackson to the end of the missing 1251b) 1252-6 different mss. indicate differ-
 ent speakers 1255 ἐπιψαύουσαν Φ 1261 σοὶ Φ 1262 πετρίνους
 Φ 1264 με καλεῖσθε Φ: μ' ἔγκ- Φ 1265 μέγα ὦ: νέον Schneidewin (pr.
 Markland): νέα Bergk 1266 κακά Φ 1267 δ' omitted Φ

- καλῶν κακῶς ἔπραξα σοῖς πεισθεῖς λόγοις.
- Νε. οὐκ οὖν ἐνεστί καὶ μεταγνῶναι πάλιν; 1270
- Φι. τοιοῦτος ἦσθα τοῖς λόγοισι χῶτε μου
τὰ τόξ' ἐκλεπτες, πιστός, ἀτηρὸς λάθραι.
- Νε. ἀλλ' οὐ τι μὴν νῦν· βούλομαι δέ σου κλύειν
πότερα δέδοκται σοι μένοντι καρτερεῖν,
ἢ πλεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν. Φι. παῦε, μὴ λέξηςι πέρα· 1275
μάτην γὰρ ἂν εἴπηις γε πάντ' εἰρήσεται.
- Νε. οὕτω δέδοκται; Φι. καὶ πέρα γ' ἴσθ' ἢ λέγω.
- Νε. ἀλλ' ἤθελον μὲν ἂν σε πεισθῆναι λόγοις
ἐμοῖσιν· εἰ δὲ μή τι πρὸς καιρὸν λέγων
κυρῶ, πέπαυμαι. Φι. πάντα γὰρ φράσεις μάτην· 1280
οὐ γὰρ ποτ' εὖνουν τὴν ἐμὴν κτήσηι φρένα,
ὅστις γ' ἐμοῦ δόλοισι τὸν βίον λαβὼν
ἀπεστέρηκας· καίτα νουθετεῖς ἐμὲ
ἐλθῶν, ἀρίστου πατρὸς ἔχθιστος γεγώς.
ὀλοισθ', Ἀτρεΐδαι μὲν μάλιστ', ἔπειτα δὲ 1285
ὁ Λαρτίου παῖς, καὶ σύ. Νε. μὴ 'πεύξῃ πέρα·
δέχου δὲ χειρὸς ἐξ ἐμῆς βέλη τάδε.
- Φι. πῶς εἴπας; [οὐκ] ἄρα δεύτερον δολοῦμεθα;
- Νε. ἀπώμοσ' ἀγνοῦ Ζηνὸς ὕψιστον σέβας.
- Φι. ὦ φίλτατ' εἰπὼν, εἰ λέγεις ἐτήτυμα. 1290
- Νε. τοῦργον παρέσται φανερόν· ἀλλὰ δεξιὰν
πρότεινε χεῖρα, καὶ κράτει τῶν σῶν ὄπλων.
- Οδ. ἐγὼ δ' ἀπαυδῶ γ', ὥς θεοὶ ξυνίστορες,
ὑπέρ τ' Ἀτρειδῶν τοῦ τε σύμπαντος στρατοῦ.
- Φι. τέκνον, τίνος φώνημα; μῶν Ὀδυσσέως 1295
ἐπηισθόμην; Οδ. σάφ' ἴσθι· καὶ πέλας γ' ὁραῖς,
ὅς σ' ἐς τὰ Τροίας πεδί' ἀποστελῶ βίαι,
ἐάν τ' Ἀχιλλέως παῖς ἐάν τε μὴ θέλῃ.
- Φι. ἀλλ' οὐ τι χαίρων, ἦν τόδ' ὀρθωθῇ βέλος.
- Νε. ἄ, μηδαμῶς, μή, πρὸς θεῶν, μετῆις βέλος. 1300
- Φι. μέθες με, πρὸς θεῶν, χεῖρα, φίλτατον τέκνον.
- Νε. οὐκ ἂν μεθείην. Φι. φεῦ· τί μ' ἄνδρα πολέμιον
ἐχθρόν τ' ἀφείλου μὴ κτανεῖν τόξοις ἐμοῖς;

1269 σοῦ Φ δόλοισι Φ 1271 οἶσθα Φ 1273 μὴ Φ 1275
παῦε T: παῦσαι ὦ 1276 ἂν ΦT: omitted Φ: ἂν ὦ 1284 ἐλθεῖν
Φ 1288 οὐκ deleted by Porson 1289 ἄγνον Wakefield ὕψιστου Φ
1291 πάρεστι Φ 1294 τ' TΦ: omitted ὦ 1300 ἄ T: ἄ ἄ ὦ 1302
τί μ' Φ: τίν' ὦ 1303 θανεῖν T

- Νε. ἄλλ' οὐτ' ἐμοὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν οὔτε σοὶ καλόν.
 Φι. ἄλλ' οὖν τοσοῦτόν γ' ἴσθι, τοὺς πρώτους στρατοῦ, 1305
 τοὺς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ψευδοκήρυκας, κακοὺς
 ὄντας πρὸς αἰχμὴν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λόγοις θρασεῖς.
 Νε. εἶεν· τὰ μὲν δὴ τόξ' ἔχεις, κοῦκ ἔσθ' ὅτου
 ὀργὴν ἔχοις ἂν οὐδὲ μέμψιν εἰς ἐμέ.
 Φι. ξύμφημι· τὴν φύσιν δ' ἔδειξας, ὦ τέκνον, 1310
 ἐξ ἧς ἐβλαστες, οὐχὶ Σισύφου πατρός,
 ἄλλ' ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως, ὃς μετὰ ζώντων ὅτ' ἦν
 ἦκου' ἄριστα, νῦν δὲ τῶν τεθνηκότων.
 Νε. ἦσθην πατέρα τὸν ἄμὸν εὐλογοῦντά σε
 αὐτόν τ' ἔμ'. ὦν δέ σου τυχεῖν ἐφίεμαι 1315
 ἄκουσον. ἀνθρώποισι τὰς μὲν ἐκ θεῶν
 τύχας δοθείσας ἔστ' ἀναγκαῖον φέρειν·
 ὅσοι δ' ἐκουσίοισιν ἐγκαινται βλάβαις,
 ὥσπερ σύ, τούτοις οὔτε συγγώμην ἔχειν
 δίκαιόν ἐστιν οὐτ' ἐποικτίρειν τινά. 1320
 σὺ δ' ἠγρίωσαι, κοῦτε σύμβουλον δέχηι,
 ἐάν τε νουθετῇ τις εὐνοίαι λέγων,
 στυγεῖς, πολέμιον δυσμενῇ θ' ἠγούμενος.
 ὁμως δὲ λέξω· Ζῆνα δ' ὄρκιον καλῶ·
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπίστω, καὶ γράφου φρενῶν ἔσω. 1325
 σὺ γὰρ νοσεῖς τόδ' ἄλγος ἐκ θείας τύχης,
 Χρύσης πελασθεὶς φύλακος, ὃς τὸν ἀκαλυφῇ
 σηκὸν φυλάσσει κρύφιος οἰκουρῶν ὄφις.
 καὶ παῦλαν ἴσθι τῆσδε μή ποτ' ἂν τυχεῖν
 νόσου βαρείας, ἔως ἂν αὐτὸς ἥλιος 1330
 ταύτῃ μὲν αἶρῃ, τῇιδε δ' αὖ δύνῃ πάλιν,
 πρὶν ἂν τὰ Τροίας πεδί' ἐκὼν αὐτὸς μόλῃς,
 καὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἐντυχῶν Ἀσκληπιδῶν
 νόσου μαλαχθῇς τῆσδε, καὶ τὰ πέργαμα
 ξὺν τοῖσδε τόξοις ξὺν τ' ἐμοὶ πέρσας φανῇς. 1335

1304 τοῦτ'... σοὶ καλόν Wakefield (pr. Valckenaer): καλὸν τοῦτ'... σοὶ ὦ: καλὸν
 τόδ'... σοὶ Φ 1308 δι Φ: omitted ὦ ὅτου Turnebus: ὅπου ὦ 1310
 δ' omitted Φ 1312 ζώντων θ' Φ 1314 πατέρα τε Φ 1314 ἄμὸν
 Τ: ἐμὸν Φ 1315 τ' ἔμ' Φ: τέ μ' ὦ σοι Φ 1316 θεοῦ Β 1318
 ἐκουσίησιν Φ: -ίαισιν ΦΤ 1319 τούτοις ΦΒ: τούτοισιν ὦ 1319-20
 οὐδὲ... οὐδ' Φ 1322 εὐνοίαι ΦΤΒ: -αν Φ: εὐνοίαν σοι Φ ἔχων Φ
 1323 δυσγεννῇ Φ 1324 καλῶν Φ 1327 Χρύσης Φ: Χρυσῆς ὦ 1329
 ἂν τυχεῖν Schäfer, Porson: ἐντυχῇν ὦ 1330 ἔως Φ: ὥς ὦ αὐτὸς Heath:
 αὐτὸς ὦ 1332 ἐκὼν αὐτὸς ΦΤ: αὐτὸς ἐκὼν ὦ

- ὥς δ' οἶδα ταῦτα τῇιδ' ἔχοντ' ἐγὼ φράσω.
 ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔστιν ἐκ Τροίας ἀλούς,
 Ἔλενος ἀριστόμαντις, ὃς λέγει σαφῶς
 ὥς δεῖ γενέσθαι ταῦτα· καὶ πρὸς τοῖσδ' ἔτι,
 ὥς ἔστ' ἀνάγκη τοῦ παρεστῶτος θέρους
 Τροίαν ἀλῶναι πᾶσαν· ἢ δίδωσ' ἐκὼν
 κτείνειν ἑαυτόν, ἣν τάδε ψευσθῇ λέγων.
 ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπεὶ κάτοισθα, συγχῶρει θέλων·
 καλὴ γὰρ ἡ 'πίκτησις, Ἑλλήνων ἓνα
 κριθέντ' ἄριστον, τοῦτο μὲν παιωνίας
 ἐς χεῖρας ἔλθειν, εἴτα τὴν πολύστονον
 Τροίαν ἐλόντα κλέος ὑπέρτατον λαβεῖν.
 Φι. ὦ στυγνὸς αἰὼν, τί μ' ἔτι δῆτ' ἔχεις ἄνω
 βλέποντα κοῦκ ἀφῆκας εἰς Αἰδου μολεῖν;
 οἴμοι, τί δράσω; πῶς ἀπιστήσω λόγοις
 τοῖς τοῦδ', ὃς εὖνους ὦν ἐμοὶ παρήνευσεν;
 ἀλλ' εἰκάθω δῆτ'; εἴτα πῶς ὁ δύσμορος
 εἰς φῶς τάδ' ἔρξας εἴμι; τῷ προσήγορος;
 πῶς, ὦ τὰ πάντ' ἰδόντες ἀμφ' ἐμοὶ κύκλοι,
 ταῦτ' ἐξανασχέσεσθε, τοῖσιν Ἀτρέως
 ἐμὲ ξυνόντα παισίν, οἳ μ' ἀπώλεσαν;
 πῶς τῷ πανώλει παιδὶ τῷ Λαερτίου;
 οὐ γάρ με τᾶλγος τῶν παρελθόντων δάκνει,
 ἀλλ' οἷα χρὴ παθεῖν με πρὸς τούτων ἔτι
 δοκῶ προλεύσσειν· οἷς γὰρ ἡ γνῶμη κακῶν
 μήτηρ γένηται, τᾶλλα παιδεύει κακά.
 καὶ σοῦ δ' ἔγωγε θαυμάσας ἔχω τόδε·
 χρῆν γὰρ σε μήτ' αὐτόν ποτ' ἐς Τροίαν μολεῖν,
 ἡμᾶς τ' ἀπείργειν, οἳ γέ σου καθύβρισαν,
 πατὴρ γέρας συλῶντες· [οἳ τὸν ἄθλιον
 Αἶαντ' ὀπλων σοῦ πατὴρ ὕστερον δίκηι
 Ὀδυσσέως ἔκριναν.] εἴτα τοῖσδε σὺ
 εἰ ξυμμαχήσων, κἄμ' ἀναγκάζεις τόδε;

1337 ἔστιν ἡμῖν Φ: ἔστιν ἡμῖν T 1342 ψευδῇ Φ λέγει Φ: λέγει Φ
 1343 ἐπειδὴ Φ 1346 εἰς Φ 1348 μ' ἔτι δῆτ' Τουρ: με δῆτ' Φ: με τῇιδ T: με
 τί δῆτ' ὦ 1353 ἔρξας Φ: ἔρξας Φ 1354 ἐμοῦ Φ 1357 τοῦ Λαερτίου
 Φ: Λαερτίου Φ 1358 μ' ἔτ' ἄλγος Φ παρεστῶτων Φ 1360 κακόν
 Φ 1361 κακοῦς: Dobree 1362 γ' Φ τάδε ΦT: τέκος Φ 1363
 καλεῖν 1364 οἳ γε Heath: οἳ τε ὦ 1365-1365b οἳ... ἔκριναν deleted by
 Brunck 1366 κἄμ' Brunck: καὶ μ' ὦ τάδε Φ

μή δῆτα, τέκνον· ἀλλ', ἅ μοι ξυνώμοσας,
πέμψον πρὸς οἴκους, καὐτὸς ἐν Σκύρῳ μένων
ἕα κακῶς αὐτοὺς ἀπόλλυσθαι κακοὺς.
χοῦτ'ω διπλῆν μὲν ἐξ ἐμοῦ κτήσῃ χάριν,
διπλῆν δὲ πατρός· κού κακοὺς ἐπωφελῶν
δόξεις ὁμοίος τοῖς κακοῖς πεφυκέναι.

1370

Νε. λέγεις μὲν εἰκότ', ἀλλ' ὁμως σε βούλομαι
θεοῖς τε πιστεύσαντα τοῖς τ' ἐμοῖς λόγοις
φίλου μετ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε τῆσδ' ἐκπλεῖν χθονός.

1375

Φι. ἦ πρὸς τὰ Τροίας πεδία καὶ τὸν Ἀτρώεω
ἐχθιστον υἱὸν τῶιδε δυστήνῳ ποδί;

Νε. πρὸς τοὺς μὲν οὖν σε τήνδε τ' ἔμπυον βάσιν
παύσοντας ἄλγους κάποσώσοντας νόσου.

Φι. ὦ δεινὸν αἶνον αἰνέσας, τί φῆις ποτε;

1380

Νε. ἅ σοί τε κάμοι λῶισθ' ὁρῶ τελούμενα.

Φι. καὶ ταῦτα λέξας οὐ κατασχύνῃ θεοὺς;

Νε. πῶς γάρ τις αἰσχύνοιτ' ἂν ὠφελῶν φίλους;

Φι. λέγεις δ' Ἀτρείδαις ὄφελος, ἢ 'π' ἐμοὶ τόδε;

Νε. σοί που, φίλος γ' ὦν, χῶ λόγος τοιόσδε μου.

1385

Φι. πῶς, ὅς γε τοῖς ἐχθροῖσί μ' ἐκδοῦναι θέλεις;

Νε. ὦ τᾶν, διδάσκου μὴ θρασύνεσθαι κακοῖς.

Φι. ὁλεῖς με, γινώσκω σε, τοῖσδε τοῖς λόγοις.

Νε. οὐκ οὐκ ἐγωγε· φημί δ' οὐ σε μανθάνειν.

Φι. ἐγὼ οὐκ Ἀτρείδας ἐκβαλόντας οἶδά με;

1390

Νε. ἀλλ' ἐκβαλόντες εἰ πάλιν σώσουσ' ὄρα.

Φι. οὐδέποθ', ἐκόντα γ' ὥστε τὴν Τροίαν ἰδεῖν.

Νε. τί δῆτ' ἂν ἡμεῖς δρῶμεν, εἰ σέ γ' ἐν λόγοις

πείσειν δυνησόμεσθα μηδὲν ὦν λέγω;

ὥς ῥαῖσθ' ἐμοὶ μὲν τῶν λόγων λῆξαι, σὲ δὲ

1395

ζῆν, ὥσπερ ἦδη ζῆις, ἄνευ σωτηρίας.

Φι. ἕα με πάσχειν ταῦθ' ἅπερ παθεῖν με δεῖ·

ἅ δ' ἥινεσάς μοι δεξιᾶς ἐμῆς θιγῶν,

πέμπειν πρὸς οἴκους, ταῦτά μοι πρᾶξον, τέκνον,

1371 τε Φ 1379 κάποσώσοντας Heath (pr. Valckenaer): κάποσώζοντας ω
1381 λῶισθ' Dindorf: κάλ' Φ: καλῶς ω 1383 ὠφελῶν φίλους Buttmann: ὠφελού-
μενος ω 1384 δ' omitted Φ τόδε Φ: τάδε ω 1385 μου Φ: μοι
ω 1386 ἐχθροῖσί μ' Valckenaer (pr. Markland): ἐχθροῖσιν ω 1390 ἐγὼ
Hermann: ἐγωγ' ω οὐκ omitted Φ 1392 Τροίαν γ' Φ ἐλεῖν Φ: ἐλθεῖν
Φ 1395 ὥς ὥρα ἔστι Φ: ὥς ὥρα ἔσται Φ μὲν omitted Φ: γε Τ 1399
πέμπειν Φ

καὶ μὴ βράδυνε μὴδ' ἐπιμνησθῆις ἔτι
Τροίας· ἄλις γάρ μοι θερῆνεται γόοις.

1400

- Νε. εἰ δοκεῖ, στείχωμεν. Φι. ὦ γενναῖον εἰρηκῶς ἔπος.
Νε. ἀντέρειδέ νυν βάσιν σὴν. Φι. εἰς ὅσον γ' ἐγὼ σθένω.
Νε. αἰτίαν δὲ πῶς Ἀχαιῶν φεύσομαι; Φι. μὴ φροντίσῃς.
Νε. τί γάρ, ἐὰν πορθῶσι χώραν τὴν ἐμήν; Φι. ἐγὼ παρῶν – 1405
Νε. τίνα προσωφέλησιν ἔρξεις; Φι. βέλεσι τοῖς Ἡρακλέους –
Νε. πῶς λέγεις; Φι. εἵρξω πελάζειν σῆς πάτρας. Νε. ἀλλ' εἰ (δοκεῖ
ταῦτα) δρᾶν ὅπως περ αὐδαῖς, στείχε προσκύσας χθόνα.

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

μήπω γε, πρὶν ἂν τῶν ἡμετέρων
ἄϊης μύθων, παῖ Ποίαντος·
φάσκειν δ' αὐδὴν τὴν Ἡρακλέους
ἀκοῇ τε κλύειν λεύσσειν τ' ὄψιν.
τὴν σὴν δ' ἦκω χάριν οὐρανίας
ἔδρας προλιπών,
τὰ Διὸς τε φράσων βουλευμάτα σοι
κατερητύσων θ' ὁδὸν ἦν στέλλῃ·
σὺ δ' ἐμῶν μύθων ἐπάκουσον.

1410

1415

καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σοι τὰς ἐμὰς λέξω τύχας,
ὅσους πονήσας καὶ διεξελθὼν πόνους
ἀθάνατον ἄρετὴν ἔσχον, ὡς πάρεσθ' ὁρᾶν·
καὶ σοί, σάφ' ἴσθι, τοῦτ' ὀφείλεται παθεῖν,
ἐκ τῶν πόνων τῶνδ' εὐκλεᾶ θέσθαι βίον.
ἐλθὼν δὲ σὺν τῶιδ' ἀνδρὶ πρὸς τὸ Τρωϊκὸν
πόλισμα, πρῶτον μὲν νόσου παύσῃ λυγρᾶς,
ἀρετῇ τε πρῶτος ἐκκριθεὶς στρατεύματος,
Πάριν μὲν, ὃς τῶνδ' αἴτιος κακῶν ἔφυ,
τόξοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι νοσφιεῖς βίου,

1420

1425

1401 τοι Φ τεθρύληται Φ γόοις Φ: λόγοις ω: λόγος Φ 1403 νυν
Matthaei: νυν ω 1406 Ἡρακλέους Brunck (pr. Markland): -εἰοις ω 1407
εἵρξω Φ δοκεῖ added by Porson 1408 (ταῦτα) δρᾶν ὅπως περ Porson: (σοὶ
τὸ) δρᾶν τὰδ' ὥσπερ Pearson: δρᾶις ταῦθ' ὥσπερ ω: δρᾶις τὰδ' ὡς Φ 1407-8 σῆς
πάτρας... αὐδαῖς deleted by Dindorf 1424 πτόλισμα Φ 1427 νοσφίσεις
Φ

πέρσεις τε Τροίαν, σκῦλα τ' εἰς μέλαθρα σὰ
 πέμπεις, ἀριστεῖ' ἐκλαβὼν στρατεύματος,
 Ποίαντι πατρὶ πρὸς πάτρας Οἴτης πλάκα. 1430
 ἃ δ' ἂν λάβῃς σὺ σκῦλα τοῦδε τοῦ στρατοῦ,
 τόξων ἑμῶν μνημεῖα πρὸς πυρὰν ἑμὴν
 κόμιζε. καὶ σοὶ ταῦτ', Ἀχιλλέως τέκνον,
 παρήνεσ'· οὐτε γὰρ σὺ τοῦδ' ἄτερ σθένεις
 ἔλῃν τὸ Τροίας πεδῖον οὔθ' οὔτος σέθεν· 1435
 ἀλλ' ὥς λέοντε συννόμῳ φυλάσσετον
 οὔτος σὲ καὶ σὺ τόνδ'. ἐγὼ δ' Ἀσκληπιὸν
 παυστήρα πέμπω σῆς νόσου πρὸς Ἴλιον.
 τὸ δεύτερον γὰρ τοῖς ἑμοῖς αὐτὴν χρεῶν
 τόξοις ἀλῶναι. τοῦτο δ' ἐννοεῖθ', ὅταν 1440
 πορθῇτε γαῖαν, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεούς·
 ὥς τᾶλλα πάντα δεύτερ' ἡγεῖται πατὴρ
 Ζεὺς· οὐ γὰρ ἡσύβεια συνθνήσκει βροτοῖς·
 κἂν ζῶσι κἂν θάνωσιν, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται.

Φι. ὦ φθέγμα ποθινὸν ἑμοὶ πέμπας, 1445
 χρόνιός τε φανείς,

οὐκ ἀπιθήσω τοῖς σοῖς μύθοις.

Νε. κἀγὼ γνώμην ταύτην τίθεται.

Ηρ. μὴ νυν χρόνιοι μέλλετε πράσσειν. 1450
 ὃδ' ἐπείγει γὰρ

καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς κατὰ πρύμνην.

Φι. φέρε νυν στείχων χώραν καλέσω.
 χαῖρ', ὦ μέλαθρον ξύμφουρον ἑμοί,

Νύμφαι τ' ἔνυδροι λειμωνιάδες,
 καὶ κτύπος ἄρσην πόντου προβολῆς, 1455

οὗ πολλάκι δὴ τοῦμὸν ἐτέγχθη

κρᾶτ' ἐνδόμυχον πληγῇσι νότου,

πολλὰ δὲ φωνῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας

Ἑρμαῖον ὄρος παρέπεμψεν ἑμοὶ

1429 ἐκλαβὼν Φ: ἐκβαλὼν ω 1430 πλάκας Φ 1433 σὺ Φ ταῦτ'
 Heath 1440 ἐννοεῖθ' Elmsley: ἐννοεῖς Φ: ἐννοεῖσθ' ω 1441 θεόν B
 1443 οὐ Christianus: ἡ ω ἡσύβεια Dawes: εὐσέβεια ω 1448 γνώμην Φ:
 γνώμη Φ: γνώμη ω ταύτην Φ 1450-1 ὃδ' ἐπείγει γὰρ moved here by
 Burges: after πλοῦς ω 1451 πρύμνην Hermann: πρύμναν ω 1452 νυν T:
 νῦν ω 1455 προβολῆς Hermann: προβλής θ' Musgrave: προβλής ω

- στόνον ἀντίτυπον χειμαζομένωι.
 νῦν δ', ὦ κρῆναι Λύκιόν τε ποτόν,
 λείπομεν ὑμᾶς, λείπομεν ἤδη,
 δόξης οὐ ποτε τῆσδ' ἐπιβάντες.
 χαῖρ', ὦ Λήμνου πέδον ἀμφιάλον,
 καί μ' εὐπλοῖαι πέμψον ἀμέμπτως
 ἔνθ' ἡ μεγάλη Μοῖρα κομίζει
 γνώμη τε φίλων χῶ πανδαμάτωρ
 δαίμων, ὃς ταῦτ' ἐπέκρανεν.
 Χο. χωρῶμεν δὴ πάντες ἀολλεῖς,
 Νύμφαις ἀλίσαισιν ἐπευξάμενοι
 νόστου σωτῆρας ἰκέσθαι.

1461 Λύκιον ΦΣ: γλύκιον ὦΣ 1465 εὐπλοῖαν πέμψατ' Φ
 νυν Τ: ἰδοὺ Φ: ἤδη ὦ ἀολλεῖς Φ: ἀολλέες ὦ

1469 δὴ Φ:

COMMENTARY

HYPOTHESEIS

Most surviving Attic tragedies and comedies are preceded in the manuscripts by at least one prose *hypothesis* ('prefatory note') outlining the plot and giving certain other information. In addition, two of Sophokles' plays (*OT* and *Ph.*) and the surviving plays of Aristophanes, apart from *Thesm.*, have verse *hypotheses* in iambic trimeters, and in one manuscript Sophokles' *El.* is followed by eight iambic trimeters, which describe themselves as 'Lines embracing the conception of the drama of Electra'.¹ The prose *hypotheses* are of three kinds. The first, of which the *hypothesis* to *Ph.* is an example, derives from the brief prefatory notes by Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–180 BCE) in his editions of Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides. These notes conveyed information that in turn probably went back through the *Pinakes* of Kallimachos to Aristotle's *Didaskaliai*, including the scene of the action, the identity of the chorus and first speaker, the date of the first production and the poet's rank in the tragic competition, the names and authors of competing dramas, the other plays in the tetralogy, the play's number in the chronological list of the author's works, and the name of the *chorēgos*. No extant *hypothesis* includes all of this information, because editors subsequent to Aristophanes treated *hypotheses* like *scholia* and felt free to add and subtract material.² That is why in some manuscripts the prose *hypothesis* to *Ph.* omits the sentences (lines 5–7) stating that Aischylos dramatized the same myth, giving the date of the first production, and saying that 'Sophokles was first' in the competition. The second kind of prose *hypothesis* is found prefixed to some plays in the manuscripts of Euripides, and in papyri relating to c. twenty other plays by Euripides and Sophokles.³ This kind of *hypothesis* offers no didascalic information, but gives an extended summary of the myth and the plot, in the past tense, and may originally have been intended as a substitute for, rather than a preface to, the play it precedes. Such *hypotheses* derive from collections of plot summaries, probably composed in the first or second century CE, which circulated independently of the plays. The third kind of prose hypothesis, probably of Byzantine origin and

¹ For these 'Lines', see Dawe 1973–8: 1.117, Ventrella 2008: 406n.5. A fourteen-line poem in elegiac couplets is among three *hypotheses* that follow the text of *OC* in one manuscript. This poem consists mainly of plot summary, along with a comment in lines 11–12 (partly corrupt) about the role of the 'ineluctable Fates'. For a papyrus fragment of a different verse *hypothesis* to *OT*, consisting of the ends of seven trimeters, and twelve-line *hypotheses* in iambic trimeters preceding the papyrus texts of Menander's *Dyskolos* and *Hērōs*, see Van Rossum-Steenbeck 1998: 34–5, 232; 40–1, 244–5.

² Zuntz 1955: 129–52, Pfeiffer 1968: 192–6, Garvie 1969: 15–17, 2009: 3. Material from this first kind of *hypothesis* sometimes found its way into a scholion; cf. *Σ Ph.* 1, *Σ Aj.* 134, Wilamowitz 1921: 147n.39.

³ Cf. Van Rossum-Steenbeck 1998: 1–32.

intended for use in schools, gives basic information, sometimes incorrect, about the myth and the plot (and, in the case of comedies, the historical context).

The verse *hypothesis* to *Ph.* and *OT* may date from the second century CE, which would make them roughly contemporaneous with the verse *hypothesis* to Aristophanes' comedies and Menander's *Dyskolos* and *Hērōs*, the acrostic and non-acrostic *argumenta* of Plautus' plays, and the *periocae* that precede Terence's. The verse *hypothesis* to *OT* presents the mythological background of the play, based on speeches by Oidipous and other characters, and a summary of the plot. The verse *hypothesis* to *Ph.*, however, refers in places to mythological details not directly relevant to Sophokles' play, and may be a misplaced version of a *hypothesis* to the *Philoktetes* of Aischylos or Euripides.

The prose *hypothesis* to *Ph.* exists in more than twice as many MSS as the verse *hypothesis*.

PROSE HYPOTHESIS

1 ἀπαγωγή: both 'the bringing away' and 'the bringing back'; *sc.* ὑπόκειται 'is set forth', 'is the subject-matter (of the play)'.

2 κατὰ μαντείαν Κάλχαντος: at Apollod. *Epit.* 5.8, Kalchas prophesies that 'Troy cannot be taken' unless the Greeks have the τόξα of Herakles fighting with them as their ally (συμμαχοῦντα), but he does not say that Phil. must be brought to Troy to wield this weapon. At *Epit.* 5.10, Kalchas says that Helenos knows oracles that protect the city, so Odysseus ambushes and captures him, but the oracles that Helenos provides make no mention of Phil., who has already come to Troy and killed Paris. Rather, Helenos says that the Greeks must have the bones of Pelops brought to them, that Neoptolemos must fight with them as their ally, and that the Palladion must be stolen from Troy. At Q. Smyrn. 9.325-35, the Atreidai send Odysseus and Diomedes to bring Phil. to Troy on the advice (ἐννεσίησιν) of Kalchas.

3 συντελοῦντας πρὸς... ἄλωσιν: συντελεῖν πρὸς or εἰς can be used of financial or other material contributions, and more generally the verb denotes 'bring about', 'accomplish', 'complete' (LSJ *s.v.* συντελέω 1.a, 11.2). Both senses are in play here.

4-5 ὁ δὲ χορός ἐκ γερόντων... συμπλεόντων: there is no indication in Soph.'s play that the Chorus are 'old men', which would be odd for a crew. Perhaps the use of this term stems from their addressing and referring to Ne. as παῖ (201, 863, 1072) and τέκνον (210, 843, 855). χορός: *sc.* συνέστηκεν.

5-6 παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ: the *hypothesis* strangely omits mention of Eur. *Ph.*

6 ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππῳ: *Ol.* 92.3 = 410-409 BCE.

METRICAL HYPOTHESIS

Metrically, the verse *hypothesis* to *Ph.* is far looser than the verse *hypothesis* to *OT*: in lines 1 and 2, ∪∪ takes the place of ∪ at position 3, and the two light syllables

are 'split' between different words; in line 7, there is an even more awkward split resolution of the *anceps* syllable at position 9; ∪ for ∪ occurs within a word at position 7 in line 9, and there may be a similar anomaly at position 3 in line 7, unless -έους in Ἡρακλέους is pronounced as a single syllable by synizesis. In line 6, ἀλώσεσθ' Ἴλιον violates Porson's law and offers an impossible elision.

1-4 **Εν . . . ναυβάττι:** in the MSS, lines 1-3 and line 4 to the first syllable of ναυβάττι are first written as prose. Then the prose breaks off, as if the scribe had just realized that the *hypothesis* was metrical, and the *hypothesis* begins again in verse, starting with the beginning of line 3.

1 **Εν Χρύσει . . . ἐπικεχωσμένον** 'the heaped up altar of Athena in Chryse'. At 1326-8 Ne. says that Phil. was bitten when he 'approached the guardian of Chryse, which guards (her) unroofed sacred space' (σηκόν). Chryse is the nymph to whom the island of Chryse (cf. 269-70.) is sacred, and Σ 194 says that Phil. was bitten when searching for her altar, where Herakles had sacrificed when he campaigned against Troy (and Phil. had accompanied him). Philostratos, *Imag.* 17, mentions an altar of Chryse that was founded by Jason, when he was en route to Kolchis, but Apollod. *Epit.* 3.27 says that the altar built by Jason was Apollo's. Other late writers, like the author of this *hypothesis*, speak of an altar of Athena, apparently identifying the nymph and the goddess, e.g. D. Chr. 59.9, Tzetzes on Lyc. 911. Brunck's Χρύσης for ἐν Χρύσει eliminates the metrical anomaly of ∪ for ∪ at position 3 (scanning Χρύσει with correction before Ἀθηνᾶς) and makes Athena Chryse the goddess' double name, cf. Athena Nike, Athena Polias). Eust. 724, 330 places the altar of Athena on Lemnos, not on Chryse. ἐπικεχωσμένον 'heaped up', i.e. 'elevated'. Cf. Tzetzes on Lyk. 911 ὅτε ἐκάθαιρεν ἐν Χρύσει τὸν κεχωσμένον βωμὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. χόω is used of heaping up earth or ash or raising a funeral mound (LSJ s.v. 1); it is an appropriate word for an altar, as some Greek altars consisted entirely of high mounds of accumulated ash and bone, cf. Burkert 1985: 87.

4 **ναυβάττι . . . στόλῳ:** cf. 270.

5 **πληγείς:** cf. 267 πληγέντ' ἐχίδνης ἀγρίῳ χαράγματι. ἐλίπετ' for ἐλείφθη (mid. for pass.) is a Homeric usage not found in Greek of the classical period.

6-7 **Ἑλενος . . . Ἀχιλλέως:** Helenos says that Troy will fall to Herakles' bow and arrows and Neoptolemos, but does not mention Phil.

8 **παρά** with a dat. after ὑπάρχω is highly unusual. Normally παρά with the dat. indicates 'beside', 'with', 'at', or in the presence' of a person or object (LSJ s.v. B), and ὑπάρχω = 'belong to' takes a simple dat. of possession.

9 **ἀμφοτέρους** must refer to Neoptolemos and Philoktetes, even though Helenos does not mention Philoktetes by name. Presumably Odysseus brought the two men to Troy separately. In the *Little Iliad* he brings Neoptolemos to Troy and Diomedes brings Philoktetes. In Aesch., Odysseus comes alone for Philoktetes, and in Eur., Odysseus and Diomedes come for him.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

In the manuscripts of surviving Attic tragedies, a list of characters, mainly in the order of their appearance, regularly precedes the text of each play. The format of such lists probably goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. Here the order of the characters is somewhat confused: Neoptolemos enters with Odysseus and the σκοπός in the Prologue, but the σκοπός does not speak until he reappears as the Ἐμπορος in the First Episode. The text refers to τὸν σκοπὸν at 125, and the speech heading at 542 is ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ (cf. 542-627n.). Some manuscripts have ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ instead of ΣΚΟΠΙΟΣ ὡς ΕΜΠΟΡΟΣ, cf. 542-627n.

1-134: OPENING SCENE (PROLOGUE)

Aristotle (*Poetics* 12.1452b19-20) defines the *prologos* as 'the whole portion of the drama prior to the entry of the Chorus'. In all of Soph.'s extant plays the Prologue consists of a dialogue that raises (at least some of) the central issues of the play and illustrates the ἦθος of at least one of the principal characters. In *Ph.* the main action of the Prologue is Od.'s successful seduction of the innocent Ne. into lying to Phil. as part of a treacherous plot to steal his bow and arrows, 'the unconquerable weapons' (78) that, Od. tells Ne., are necessary for the conquest of Troy. Od. is characterized as an opportunistic representative of the Greek army at Troy, interested in victory above all else, and Ne. is an innocent youth eager to gain the glory of sacking the city and thus to live up to the standard of his father, Achilles.

The setting is a desolate spot on the northeast coast of Lemnos, near Mt Hermaion (cf. 1458-60). See Introd., pp. 13-14. The *eisodos* on the audience's left is imagined as leading to the ship and the sea, and that on their right to the rest of the island. Od. and Ne. enter from the left, followed by at least one sailor, the lookout (cf. 45, 48), whom Od. at 125 says he is sending back to the ship but may send out again, disguised as a merchant ship's captain, to assist Ne. Presumably this sailor exits with Od. after 134, unless he leaves a few lines earlier, after 131 or 132.

The Prologue falls into three main parts: (1) in 1-49, Od. tells how he had abandoned Ph. in this very place ten years earlier; Ne. finds Phil.'s cave (16), and Od. warns that they must guard against Phil.'s approach, because 'he would rather get hold of me than all the (other) Argives' (46-7); (2) in 50-95, Od. tells Ne. that he must 'be clever' (77) and surrender himself temporarily to a shameless action, in order to steal the bow, but Ne. hesitates to do this, lest he prove false to his inborn nature; (3) in 96-134 Od. convinces Ne. to cooperate in the intrigue by lying to Phil., because only in this way can Ne. have the glory of sacking Troy. Od. dominates the Prologue, speaking more than twice as many lines as Ne. (96.5/37.5).

1-11 ἀκτὴ... στενάζων: this opening sentence establishes an epic tone, suitable to heroic characters and events known from the epic cycle, through its exceptional length and repeated enjambment (e.g. 1, 3, 4, 8, 9).

1 ἀκτὴ μὲν ἦδε 'this is the shore'. The demonstrative pronoun is frequently attracted into the gender of a predicate substantive, when it is connected to the substantive by an expressed or understood copulative verb. Cf. 61 τήνδε, *SCG* 1.58, Smyth §1239. μὲν stands alone and is not answered by 11-12 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα... λέγειν, which instead responds to the whole sentence in 1-11 (Smyth §2784). μὲν, 'with or without an expressed or implied antithesis', is found in the opening lines of *Aj.*, *Tr.*, and all Aesch.'s surviving plays except *Sept.* and *Cho.* (*GP* 382-3). περιρρύτου is a Homeric ἀπαξ λεγόμενον (*Od.* 19.173), also used at 239 of Skyros. Here it may suggest from the start an analogy between Phil., isolated on 'sea-surrounded' Lemnos, and Odysseus in *Od.* 1, isolated on Kalypso's 'sea-surrounded island' (νήσωι ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, 1.50, 198). Cf. *Il.* 2.721 (describing Phil.) ~ *Od.* 5.13 (describing Od.) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσωι κείτο / κείται κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων.

2 Λήμνου... οἰκουμένη: Λήμνου is probably in apposition to 1 χθονός rather than dependent on it. ἄστιπτος and οὐδ' οἰκουμένη modify ἀκτὴ: it is the shore, not the island, that is 'untrodden by mortals and not inhabited', though unlike Aesch. and Eur., in whose Philoktetes-plays the chorus consisted of native Lemnians, Soph. seems to have made the entire island uninhabited. Thus Soph. departs strikingly both from mythological tradition and from the real condition of the island, which would have been well known to an Athenian audience (see *Intro.*, p. 7). **ἄστιπτος... οἰκουμένη:** cf. *OC* 39 ἄθικτος οὐδ' οἰκητός. ἄστιπτος, a synonym of ἄστιβής (cf. *Aj.* 657, *OC* 126, Aesch. *Sept.* 859), occurs only here in extant Greek literature, except for a figurative use by Synesios of Cyrene (fourth-fifth century CE), *Hymni* 3.40 λύπαις... ἄστιπτος ψυχά. Cf. *Aj.* 874 ἐστιβηται with Kamerbeek's comment. Paradoxically, the land 'untrodden by mortals' is home to the στίβος ('tread', 'footstep') of Phil. (163, 206, 487). Elsewhere in the play (e.g. 29, 48, 487), στίβος seems to be used of human tracks or footfalls, but even in these passages it may refer to Phil.'s distinctive 'tread', his way of walking.

3-5 Soph. departs radically from the traditional myth by introducing Ne. as *Od.*'s companion in bringing Phil. back to the Greek army. See *Intro.*, pp. 5-6, 23. The three references to fathers and sons herald the importance of this theme in the play, where *Od.* and Phil. in effect compete to be the 'father' of Ne. Cf. 130n. For other patronymics, cf. 50, 87, 329, 333, 416, 461, 562, 614, 679, 1066, 1261, and the play's nineteen references to the 'Atreidae'.

3 κρατίστου... τραφεῖς 'bred from' (not 'reared by') 'a father who was mightiest of the Greeks' (Jebb). πατρός is either gen. of origin (cf. *Ant.* 38 εἴτ' εὐγενὴς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλὼν κακῇ, *OT* 1082 τῆς γὰρ πέφυκα μητρός) or gen. of the agent (often found with past participles and neg. verbal adjectives, cf. 1066-7n. Ἑλλήνων is anachronistic: in Homer the Greeks are called Ἀργεῖοι, Ἀχαιοί,

or Δαναοί, and Ἕλληνες refers to a specific tribe from Thessalian Phthiotis ruled by Achilles (*Il.* 2.684, cf. Thucyd. 1.3.3). Elsewhere in the play the Greek army is referred to mainly as Ἀχαιοί (10x) or Ἀργεῖοι (8x), once as Δαναοί, and twice as Ἕλληνες. Such anachronism is common in Attic tragedy: the poets tried to recreate the world of Homeric epic and archaic lyric, which the heroes of their plays inhabited, but they also felt free, within limits, to combine that world with their own, often in such a way as to complicate traditional stories and characters or to suggest contradictions between traditional and modern institutions and values (cf. Easterling 1985). Od. may have seemed to a late fifth-century Athenian audience to use the term Ἕλληνες in order to arouse in Ne. a kind of patriotic sentiment, which would make him willing to join in the intrigue against Phil. and thus assist the Greek army against its Asian enemy. In Eur.'s *Philoctetes*, patriotic feeling played a key role in Od.'s successful effort to persuade Phil. to come to Troy to help the Greek army; cf. *Introd.*, p. 6. It is less likely that Od. is using Ἑλλήνων in its historically correct, Homeric sense.

4 Ἀχιλλέως παῖ Νεοπτόλεμος: the combination of proper name and patronymic is unusual in Soph. and limited to formal addresses and self-identifications, e.g. 263, 1261. See Griffith on *Ant.* 211–12. The first two syllables of Neoptolemos' name are pronounced here as a single syllable by synizesis, and the name must be scanned –υυυ. The final two syllables constitute resolution of the normally heavy eighth element of the line – in conventional terminology, the final syllable of the second metron. Elsewhere in Soph., the metrical word-shape –υυυ⁸ occurs only in *OC* 42 and 486 in the name Εὐμενίδας. Metrical anomalies in the iambic trimeter often reflect the difficulty of fitting in a proper name (though this is not the case in the only instance of –υυυ⁸ in Aesch., *Eum.* 107 νηφάλια).

4–5 τὸν Μηλιά | Ποιάντος υἱὸν 'the Malian, | (the) son of Poias'. As Σ observes, Μηλιά is an Attic contraction of Μηλιάς; cf. *Tr.* 194 Μηλιεύς. Malis is a region on the east coast of mainland Greece, beneath Mt Oita and across the Strait of Euripos from the northwest coast of Euboea. At *Il.* 2.682, the region including Malis is one of the areas ruled by Achilles, while Phil. rules an area further north (2.716–17). Poias is King of Malis and father of Phil.; cf. *Od.* 3.190 Ποιάντιον ἀγλαὸν υἱόν, Pind. *Pyth.* 1.53 Ποιάντος υἱὸν τοξόταν. Poias might have been known to Soph.'s original audience as one of the Argonauts (cf. [Apollod.] 1.9.16, 26), and they almost certainly would have understood 'the Malian, | (the) son of Poias' as Phil. In any case, Od.'s reference in the next few lines to having abandoned him on Lemnos because of his diseased foot makes his identity completely clear. Phil. is called by name only six times in the play: 54, 101, 263, 432, 575, 1261; at 318, 329, 461, 1230, 1410 he is simply 'son of Poias'.

5 ἐξέθηκ' ἐγὼ ποτε: Aristotle, *Poetics* 24.1460a36, refers to the story of Odysseus being put ashore in Ithaca by the Phaeacians (*Od.* 13.116–25) as τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐκθεσιν, but ἐκτίθημι is not attested elsewhere in this sense. It is, however, the usual word for 'exposing' an infant and leaving it to die, e.g. Eur. *Ion* 344,

951, Hdt. 1.112.1, 2, Ar. *Nub.* 531. ἐγὼ ποτε at the end of the line is emphatic, as if Od. claims special credit for abandoning Phil. ('I was the one who once...').

6–7 Od. tries to present his own actions in the best light. In other versions of the story it is not clear that Od. abandoned Phil. on Lemnos specifically at the command of the Atreidai (cf. Budelmann 2000: 102).

6 ταχθεις... ὑπο: cf. *OC* 850–1 ὕφ' ὧν | ταχθεις τόδ' ἔρδω, spoken by Kreon, who is portrayed similarly to Od. as an opportunistic politician, 'clever with his tongue' (*OC* 806), who claims to represent his community and is prepared to treat others treacherously and violently as means to his ends (e.g. *OC* 867, 874, 922–3). See 90n., 96–9n. Cf. Eur. *Li* 1363 ἴδια πράσσων ἢ στρατοῦ ταχθεις ὑπο; **ὑπο:** when a disyllabic preposition follows the noun it governs, the usual accent on the final syllable becomes an acute on the first syllable by 'anastrophe'. In Soph., anastrophe occurs only with ἄπο, ἐπι, κάτω, μέτα, πάρα, πέρι, ὑπερ, ὑπο (Moorhouse 94, Smyth §175). It is most common at the end of the trimeter. **τῶν ἀνασσόντων:** this is the only example in extant archaic and classical Greek literature of the participle of ἀνάσσω ('to be king', 'to rule over') used substantively. In the *Il.*, Agamemnon's standing as *primus inter pares* is denoted by κοίρανος (e.g. 2.204) or σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς (e.g. 1.279).

7 νόσωι... πόδα lit. 'dripping in respect to his foot with the disease that was eating through it'. καταστάζοντα agrees with υἱὸν in line 5, and νόσωι and πόδα come emphatically at the beginning and end of the line. πόδα is acc. of respect but is also felt as obj. of the verbal force in διαβόρωι. διάβορος, an adj. of two endings, is similarly active in *Tr.* 1084 ἡ τάλαινα διάβορος νόσος, but passive in *Tr.* 676 τοῦτ' ἡφάνισται διάβορον. It occurs only in these three Sophoklean passages, but cf. 313 βόσκων τὴν ἀδήφαγον νόσον ('feeding the insatiable disease'), 745 βρύκμαι ('I am being eaten'). Σ comments on διαβόρωι: 'the disease eating the foot makes it putrid, utterly consuming it, the so-called canker-sore (φαγέδαινα)... this suffering is spoken of in this way by the physicians'. Cf. Hipp. *Aēr.* 10, καὶ φαγέδαινας κίνδυνος ἐγγίνεσθαι ἀπὸ πάσης προφάσιος, Aesch fr. 253 (from *Philoktetes*): φαγέδαιναν, ἥ μου σάρκας ἐσθίει πόδα, Eur. fr. 792A (from *Philoktetes*) φαγέδαιναν ἥ μου σάρκα θοινᾶται πόδα. διαβόρωι slightly personifies the νόσος, which elsewhere is metaphorically a 'wild beast' living in Phil.'s foot (697 ἐνθ' ἡρου ποδός) and which comes and goes from time to time (758–9).

8–11 δτ'... στενάζων: Od. invokes religious considerations in the effort to justify to Ne. his treatment of Phil., but does not refer to Phil.'s lameness and foul odour, which Phil. later implies were also reasons given for abandoning him (cf. 1031–2 with 1031n.). Od. similarly tries to legitimate his actions on religious grounds at 989–90, 993, and Phil. in effect rejects this claim at 992 θεοὺς προτείων τοὺς θεοὺς ψευδεῖς τίθης.

8 ἡμίν: Soph. uses the dat. plur. forms ἡμίν and ὑμίν when a light syllable is needed for metrical reasons before a word beginning with a vowel. There are 29 instances of ἡμίν in the seven plays (including *Ph.* 8, 465) and 15 of ὑμίν (including *Ph.* 531). ἡμίν and ὑμίν are nowhere certain in Aesch. or Eur., but ἡμίν

is probable at *PV* 821, ὑμῖν may be right at Aesch. *Supp.* 959, and αὐμῖν at Aesch. *Eum.* 349. See Friis Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 959, Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum.* 349.

8–9 οὔτε λοιβῆς . . . προσθιγεῖν lit. ‘for us undisturbed to set our hands to (i.e. ‘to carry out’) neither a libation nor sacrifices’. Verbs of touching regularly govern the gen. ‘Ritual silence’ (εὐφημία) was required to ensure that an offering would be auspicious and acceptable to the god, and Od. goes on to claim that Phil.’s sounds (11 βοῶν, στενάζων) were inauspicious (cf. 10 δυσφημίαις).

9 ἀγρίαις: ἄγριος ‘savage’ is a key word and concept in the play. It is used both of Phil.’s disease (173, 265) and of the mark of the serpent that caused the disease (267). Cf. *Tr.* 1030 ἀγρία νόσος, 975 ἀγρίαν ὁδύνην.) When Phil. first meets Ne. and the Chorus, he speaks of himself as ἀπηγριωμένον ‘having become savage’ (226), and when, after regaining his bow, he continues to refuse Ne.’s entreaties to accompany him to Troy, Ne. accuses him of having become (or having made himself) ‘savage’ (1321 σὺ δ’ ἡγρίωσαι).

10 κατεῖχ’ . . . δυσφημίαις: the imperf. κατεῖχ’ with αἰεῖ suggests (1) that Phil. on repeated occasions (or repeatedly on a single occasion) ‘filled the army’s camps with his ill-omened cries’ (see LSJ *s.v.* κατέχω II.b.2), which interrupted their sacrifices; cf. *Il.* 16.78–9 οἱ δ’ ἀλαλητῶι | πᾶν πεδίον κατέχουσι, *Aj.* 142, Eur. *Trö.* 556; (2) that Phil. repeatedly ‘held back (i.e. ‘prevented’) the camp (from sacrificing) with his ill-omened cries’ (cf. LSJ *s.v.* κατέχω I.b). κατεῖχετ’, the reading of most MSS., is unmetrical, and in general the middle and passive of κατέχω are quite rare (LSJ *s.v.*): Soph. never uses the middle and has only one instance of the passive, *Tr.* 249 κατείχεθ’.

11 βοῶν, στενάζων: the asyndeton, followed by strong punctuation, is emphatic: cf. *Tr.* 787 βοῶν, ἰύζων, Eur. *Andr.* 1154 βάλλων, ἀράσσων, *Or.* 951 κλαίοντες, οἰκτίροντες, Bruhn, *Anhang* §158, Smyth §§2165–6. βοῶν, ἰύζων, the reading of several MSS, is an echo or quotation of *Tr.* 787 introduced by an editor or copyist.

11–14 ἀλλὰ . . . δοκῶ: Od. interrupts his self-justification, foreclosing discussion and emphasizing to Ne., by the standard contrast between word and deed, that it is now time for action. For ἀλλὰ (impatently) interrupting a previous remark or line of thought, cf. 15, 77, Smyth §2784.

11–12 ἀλλὰ . . . λέγειν: 11 ταῦτα μὲν is correlated with 15 ἀλλ’ ἔργον. Enjambment, where the syntax and sense carry over from one trimeter to the next without the possibility of a pause, is much more common in Soph. than in Aesch. or Eur. (cf. Griffith 1977: 96). Frequently the enjambment involves a conjunction such as ἢνα or ὅπως, less often (as here) δεῖ or χρή, as the final word of the line. Cf. *OC* 1148–9 χῶπας μὲν ἄγων ἡρέθη, τί δεῖ μάτην | κομπεῖν; Eur. *Hec.* 960–1 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν τί δεῖ | θρηνεῖν; ἀκμή . . . λόγων: lit. ‘it is for us the right time for not long speeches’, i.e. ‘we do not have time for long speeches’. ἀκμή means ‘the highest or culminating point’, but when used of time it is virtually equivalent to καιρός, ‘the (most) opportune moment’ (LSJ *s.v.* ἀκμή

π, π). Cf. *El.* 22 ἴν' οὐκέτ' ὀκνεῖν καιρός, ἀλλ' ἔργων ἀκμή, *Eur. Tro.* 87–8 ἡ χάρις γὰρ οὐ μακρῶν λόγων | δεῖται.

13 μὴ... ἦκοντα 'lest he actually learn that I am come'. On μὴ alone – without ἵνα, ὥς, or ὅπως – in neg. purpose clauses, see *GMT* §§307–10, 315, *Smyth* §§2193–4. καί, 'calling attention to the point of what is said' (*Campbell, Essay* §25.a.1), adverbially modifies μάθη. Cf. 46 μὴ καὶ λάθῃ με, 534 ὥς με καὶ μάθη, *GP.* 298. As usual, μανθάνω, like other verbs of learning and knowing, takes the participle in indirect discourse.

13–14 κάκχέω... δοκῶ: ἐκχέω is aor. subjunct., parallel to μάθη. In the crasis of καί and ἐκχέω, καί implies consequence or result: 'and so I lose' (*Campbell*), cf. 286, 490, 1061. For the sense of ἐκχέω, cf. *Theognis* 110 ἐκκέχυται φιλότης, *Aesch. Pers.* 826 ὄλβον ἐκχέη μέγαν. *Soph.* uses the prefix ἐκ- with exceptional frequency in verbs and adjectives, cf. *Rigo* 167–75, *Tsitsoni* 1963. In such compounds ἐκ- can add the sense 'out', 'away', 'as a result of', or 'after', and it frequently has an intensifying or 'completive' force similar to that of δια-, indicating that the action of a verb is done utterly, thoroughly, or fully. Cf. 330 ἐξελωβήθη, 423 ἐξήρκε, 668 κάξεπεύξασθαι. 'Verbs compounded with ἐκ... are especially frequent as "corrective intensifiers"', when they come after a simple form of the same verb (*Renahan* 1976: 24), e.g. *Tr.* 335–7... ὅπως | μάθη. οὐστινάς γ' ἄγεις ἔσω | ὦν τ' οὐδὲν εἰσήκουσας ἐκμάθῃς ἃ δεῖ, *OT* 574–6. Cf. *Moorhouse*: 108–11.

τὸ πᾶν: the def. art. has an intensifying force, as it frequently does before adjectives indicating size, length, or quantity, e.g. 306 τῷ μακρῷ, *El.* 1335 τῶν μακρῶν λόγων. τὸ πᾶν at the end of the line, describing σοφισμα at the beginning of 14, also gains emphasis from the enjambment. Cf. 665–6, 1063–4, 1327–8, 1376–7.

σοφισμα 'clever contrivance'. Here, as elsewhere in the Prologue, *Od.* uses a word that associates him with a kind of fifth-century intellectualism typical of the sophistic movement: cf. 77 σοφισθῆναι 'be clever', 80 τεχνᾶσθαι 'contrive', 119 σοφός 'clever', 131 τὰ συμφέροντα 'the things that are expedient', 'in our interest'. Though the Sophists were not specifically concerned with σοφίσματα, elsewhere in Attic tragedy σοφίζομαι and σοφισμα(τα) involve the sort of cleverness, subtlety, rationality, or scientific thinking associated with the Sophists. 'Clever contrivance' need not have a negative valence; cf. *Aesch. PV* 459 ἀριθμὸν ἑοχον σοφισμάτων. By the late fifth century, however, σοφίζομαι and σοφισμα can connote something sly, tricky, or artificial (see, e.g., *Eur. Ba.* 489, *IA* 744, *Ar. Ran.* 17, 872), as well as language or action that is insincere, pretentious, or (in the modern sense of the word) a sophism (e.g. *Plato Rep.* 496a7, *Phdr.* 229c7). At 431, *Ne.* attacks *Od.* as a 'clever wrestler', using a metaphor that can refer to sophistic argument (cf. 431–2n.); cf. 1244–5 and *Protagoras'* work entitled *Καταβάλλοντες* (*Arguments*) *that Throw Down* [*an Opponent*]). At 1013–15, *Phil.* bitterly accuses *Od.* of corrupting *Ne.* by teaching him to be σοφός ἐν κακοῖς ('cunning in evils'), and in *Soph. fr.* 913 (from an unknown play) *Od.* is called (τὸ) πάνσοφον κρότημα. *Od.* is also linked with σοφισμα at *Eur. Hec.* 258, *Cyc.* 450; cf. *Blundell* 1987: 326–7.

τῷ: *Soph.*

uses the epic form of the relative pronoun – identical to the definite article – more frequently in both dialogue and lyric than do Aesch. and Eur., always (except for *Tr.* 47) where it helps to avoid hiatus within the line; this form is not found in Attic prose. Here, there is perhaps a special effect in juxtaposing the epicism with its grammatical antecedent, σόφισμα, a fifth-century concept. Od. is a figure from the heroic world of traditional epic, but he is characteristically modern in his reliance on the intellectual ‘cleverness’ denoted by σοφός and σόφισμα rather than the ‘cunning intelligence’ (μῆτις) that is his distinctive mental quality in epic (Pucci 160).

15 ἀλλ’... ὑπηρετεῖν: Od. breaks off (ἀλλ’) from speaking generally about his ‘clever plan’ and turns to specific action. Cf. 11–14n. **ἔργον... σόν** is a variation on the colloquial σὸν ἔργον, either followed by a complementary inf. (e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 1345, *Ran.* 590, *Eccl.* 514) or as an independent statement followed by an imper. (e.g. Aesch. *PV* 635, Eur. *El.* 668, Ar. *Lys.* 381). Coming at position 6, but agreeing with ἔργον in the first colon of the line, σόν completes a semantic unit and bisects the trimeter rhetorically, playing against the caesura at position 5. This kind of tension between metrical and rhetorical form is common in *Ph.* (e.g. 121, 479, 503, 907, 1021, 1049) and in *Soph.* generally. **ὑπηρετεῖν** ‘to serve’ suggests, somewhat disrespectfully and in striking contrast to 3–4, that Ne. is Od.’s subordinate and should do as he is told (cf. 53 with n.). By contrast, in 93 Ne. speaks of himself as Od.’s ξυνεργάτης ‘co-worker’, cf. *Aj.* 1329 ξυνηρετεῖν. ὑπηρετεῖν (from ὑπὸ + ἐρέσσω) means literally ‘to row beneath’, and ὑπηρεσία was a distinctively Athenian term for the rowers or ships’ crews in their warships. Here as elsewhere, Od. uses language that, especially for an Athenian audience, would associate him with Athens or Athenian institutions. Cf. Rehm 2002: 154–5, *Introd.*, pp. 11–12, 20–1.

16 ὅπου ’στ’ ἐνταῦθα... πέτρα ‘where in this place there is a double-mouthed rock-cave’, with prodelision of the ε and elision of the ι in ἐστί. Cf. *OT* 732 καὶ ποῦ ’σθ’ ὁ χῶρος, *OC* 296 καὶ ποῦ ’σθ’ ὁ κραινῶν; πέτρα ‘rock’ takes on the meaning ‘rock-cave’ from the presence of δίστομος, cf. 952 σχῆμα πέτρας γύαλον, 1081 κοίλη πέτρας γύαλον, *LSJ* s.v. πέτρα 2.

17 τοιάδ’, ἵν’ ‘of such a kind, where’. Adverbial ἵνα is relatively more frequent in *Soph.* than in Aesch. or Eur., cf. Kamerbeek: 29.

17–19 Od. paints a somewhat idyllic picture of Phil.’s dwelling; contrast Phil.’s description at 1082 θερμὸν καὶ παγετώδες. The diction here is quite distinctive: ἐνθάκης is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον; ἀμφιτρής occurs elsewhere only at Eur. *Cyc.* 707, describing the Kyklops’ cave; αὔλιον, also used of Phil.’s dwelling at 954 and 1087, appears nowhere else in tragedy, but denotes the Kyklops’ cave in Eur. *Cyc.* 222, 345, 593. Cf. *Introd.*, pp. 17–18.

17–18 ἡλίου διπλῇ | ... ἐνθάκης ‘a two-fold possibility of sitting in the sun’, cf. *OC* 9 θάκηςιν. ἡλίου is governed by the verbal force in ἐνθάκης, although θακεῖν ἐν would require a dat. (Campbell, *Essay* 12–13 §9.2.a). This is preferable to taking ἡλίου as gen. of quality (Smyth §§1320–1, Moorhouse 54)

describing the character of the ἐνθάκησις, ‘a sunny possibility of sitting’, i.e. ‘a sunny seat’. For ἥλιος ‘sunshine’, see Plato *Phd.* 116e2; cf. Thuc. 7.87.1.

19 Ne. begins to ascend the cliff after this line, if he has not already begun to do so while Od. speaks the sentence running from 15 to 19. He has seen the cave opening by the beginning of 25.

20 βαιὸν . . . ἀριστερεᾶς ‘and a little below, on the left’; cf. *El.* 7 οὐς ἀριστερεᾶς. βαιὸν is adverbial; ἐξ is used in the sense of ἐν, as, e.g., ἐκείθεν can have the sense of ἐκεῖ (LSJ *s.v.* ἐκείθεν 1.2).

20–1 τάχ’ ἂν | ἴδοις . . . σῶν: the potential optative is more polite and ‘urbane’ than a simple future would be (Smyth §§1824, 1826, Moorhouse 230). τάχ’ ἂν may anticipate the doubt expressed in εἴπερ ἐστὶ σῶν, though the indicative ἐστὶ suggests that Od. believes the ‘spring of drinkable water’ to be still ‘flowing’ (LSJ *s.v.* σῶς 11.1). ποτόν κρηναῖον: cf. 1461 ὦ κρῆναι Λυκίων τε ποτόν, *Ti.* 14 κρηναίου ποτοῦ, though ποτόν is used more frequently of wine than of water (LSJ *s.v.*, cf. πότος ‘drinking bout’).

22–3 ἃ μοι . . . κυρεῖ lit. ‘going for me toward those things [*sc.* the cave and the spring] in silence signal whether he still holds to this same place or is elsewhere’. The position of μοι shows that it is ethical dat. (Smyth §1486), indicating the interest of the person speaking, rather than indir. obj. of σήμαιν’. Cf. 98 βροτοῖς. The adv. σίγα, modifying προσελθὼν, could, by position, also go with σήμαιν’, but Ne. ‘signals’ Od. not with silent gestures but by speaking.

As transmitted in the MSS, 22–3 presents both textual and interpretive difficulties:

(i) σήμαιν’ violates ‘Porson’s law’, according to which the tragic poets avoid ending a polysyllabic word at position 9 of the iambic trimeter in a heavy syllable (i.e., when the first syllable of the third metron is long), unless the polysyllabic word is followed by an enclitic or is part of a word-group ending with a post-positive at position 10. There are four other cases in the MSS of Soph. and Eur. in which ‘Porson’s Law’ appears to be violated: *Aj.* 1101 ἔξεστ’ ἀνάσσειν ὧν δδ’ ἡγεῖτ’ οἰκόθεν, Eur. *Hcll.* 529 καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθ’ εἰ δοκεῖ, *IT* 580 κάμοι. τὸ δ’ εὖ μάλιστα γ’ οὕτω γίγνεται, and *Ion* 1 Ἄτλας ὁ χαλκίοισι νώτοις οὐρανόν. More or less plausible emendations that remove the violations have been proposed (but are by no means universally accepted) in *Aj.* 1101 and *IT* 580, and there is evidence of a metrically normal version of *Ion* 1 (see the app. crit. in Diggle’s edn). That leaves 22 here and *Hcll.* 529 in which the metrical anomalies are not easily removed by emendation, though they are perhaps mitigated by elision (as would be the case in *Aj.* 1101 without emendation). It seems best to accept the metrical irregularity in 22 and to consider that the tragic poets’ avoidance of polysyllabic word-end in a heavy syllable at position 9 was not absolute. Porson himself, when he first set forth his discovery in 1802 in the Supplement to the Preface of his edition of Eur. *Hec.*, spoke of a *regula* (‘rule’,

'norm'), not a *lex* ('law'), which the tragic poets observed *plerumque* ('for the most part') (Porson xxxii-xxxiii).

(ii) εἴτ' ἔχει | χῶρον τὸν αὐτὸν τόνδ' ἔτ' 'whether he holds this same place still'. Blaydes's substitution of τόν for πρὸς of the MSS produces an easy construction for which there is a parallel in 154 χῶρον τίν' ἔχει. Although there are (1) several instances of intransitive ἔχει with κατά in the sense 'keep to a particular place' (e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.72 ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ Τυρσανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχει, Hdt. 6.39.2 Μιλτιάδης... εἶχε κατ' οἶκους), and (2) several instances of πρὸς with the acc. in the sense 'next to' or 'beside', with no implication of motion toward an object (e.g. *El.* 930-1 (τοῦ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ποτ' ἦν) | τὰ πολλὰ πατρὸς πρὸς τάφον κτερίσματα; *Il.* 12.63-4 σκόλοπες γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ | ὀξέες ἐστάσιν, ποτὶ δ' αὐτοὺς τείχος Ἀχαιῶν), there are no parallels for ἔχει πρὸς with the acc. in the sense required.

(iii) τόνδ' ἔτ' is Elmsley's correction of the unmetrical τόνδ' found in most MSS and τόνδε γ' found in several. If the latter reading were correct, γ' would emphasize τόνδ'. τόνδ' ἔτ', however, is more pointed, restoring a rhetorically climactic, and therefore emphatic, adv.: 'whether he holds this same place *still* or he is elsewhere'. For a similar instance of ἔτ' omitted or changed in some MSS before a monosyllabic word beginning with ε, cf. *Tr.* 23.

24-5 ὥς... ἦνι is a purpose construction with three subjunctive verbs in three successive clauses. τὰπίλοιπα is crasis of τὰ ἐπίλοιπα. Perhaps τὰπίλοιπα τῶν λόγων is used instead of τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους λόγους, because the λόγοι are thought of collectively, not individually, i.e. as a kind of magnitude or quantity; in such cases substantive adjectives may be used in the neuter. Cf. *Ant.* 499-500 τῶν σῶν λόγων | ἀρεστὸν οὐδέν, *Tr.* 682 θεσμῶν οὐδέν, Plato *Rep.* 352b5 τὰ λοιπὰ μοι τῆς ἐστιάσεως, Smyth §1314, K-G 1.340.

25 κοινὰ... ἦνι 'so that joint action may proceed from both (of us)'. The scholiast's gloss προβαῖνοι supports Camerarius' emendation ἦνι. ἀμφοῖν: the dual is used 'of two personages or things which by nature or association form a pair' (Smyth §999), and ἀμφώ indicates two things that belong together. Here, as in 133 νῶιν, *Od.* uses a dual form persuasively, in order to make Ne. feel that the two of them are on an equal footing, though the antithesis in 24-5 implies that he himself will tell Ne. what to do and Ne. will obey his directions (cf. 15, 53; 133n.). Cf. 533 with 533-4n., Eur. *Med.* 870-1 τὰς δ' ἐμᾶς ὀργὰς φέρειν | εἰκὸς σ', ἐπεὶ νῶιν πόλλ' ὑπείργασται φίλα. For other persuasive or strategic duals, see 539 with 539-41n., 627 with n., 779 with n., cf. 1079 with n.

26 τοὔργον... λέγεις 'the task you speak of is not far off'. τοὔργον is crasis of τό and ἔργον. μακράν is a predicate adv. signifying a long extent of time or (more frequently, as here) of space. Cf. 42, *Tr.* 962-3 ἀγχοῦ... κοῦ μακρὰν προὔκλειον.

27 οἶον... εἰσορᾶν 'I think I see the sort of cave you mentioned.' As often, an indirect question with οἷος precedes the verb (εἰσορᾶν) that introduces it.

εἶπας, a first aor. form of a kind found mostly in Ionic prose, is also common in Attic poetry in the second person sing. indic. and imper.

28 ἄνωθεν, ἣ κάτωθεν: Od. stands at the base of the cliff that rises above the shore, looking up at Ne. Cf. 19n., Intro., p. 13. οὐ γὰρ ἐννοῶ ('I ask) for I don't have a clear picture in my mind', i.e. 'I don't understand.' γὰρ frequently introduces an explanation of why a speaker has just asked or said something (*GP* 60–1). ἐννοῶ preserves a root meaning of νοέω, 'visualize mentally' (cf. von Fritz 1943: 88–90), which later develops into 'see in the mind', then into 'take thought for', 'know', 'understand'. ἐννοῶ exists in both active and deponent forms, but Aesch. and Soph. always use the active, e.g. 1440, *Aj.* 115, Aesch. *Ag.* 1088. Cf. 1440n.

29–39 Like the description of the cave (17–19), the details of its contents are presented in unusual language: 29 ἐξύπερθε, 30 καταυλισθεῖς, 32 οἰκοποιός, 35 αὐτόξυλον, φλαουρουγοῦ, 37 θησαύρισμα, and 39 νοσηλείας are unique within the surviving Sophoklean corpus; φλαουρουγοῦ is ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in extant Greek literature, and ἐξύπερθε(ν) reoccurs only in the Hellenistic tragic poet Ezekiel, *Exagōgē* 78 (*TrGF* I 1971: 292). As Ne. names, one after another, the bare essentials he sees in the cave – the pressed-down leaves on which Phil. sleeps, the crude wooden cup, the kindling – he not only communicates the primitive quality of Phil.'s life on Lemnos, but implies the inhumanity of those who abandoned him there. The shocking climax (cf. 38 τοῦ τοῦ) of Ne.'s discoveries is the 'rags' that are 'drying out, full of some heavy discharge from the disease' (38–9). The emotion expressed by τοῦ τοῦ may suggest that Ne. begins to develop sympathy for Phil. even before he meets him. Cf. Seale 1982: 29.

29 καὶ . . . κτύπος 'and of a footfall there is no sound'. Although καὶ . . . γε often constitute a unit ('yes, and . . .'), here they work independently, and γε goes closely with στίβου' (*GP* 159). For στίβου 'footfall' also suggesting Phil.'s distinctive στίβος, his way of walking; cf. 2n. The MS variant τύπος would refer to a visible footprint rather than an audible sound, but Od.'s response in 30 – 'perhaps you hear no sound, because he is asleep' – makes sense as a response to κτύπος rather than τύπος, since the absence of a footprint would not suggest that Phil. might be asleep inside the cave.

30 ὅρα . . . μὴ . . . κυρῆι: the subjunctive signifies doubt in Od.'s mind, while the MS variant κυρεῖ (indic.) would indicate certainty on his part that Phil. actually is asleep within the cave. The indic. is more common after ὅρα μὴ, but cf. *El.* 1003–4 ὅρα κακῶς πράσσοντε μὴ μείζω κακὰ | κτησώμεθ' . . .

31 ὁρῶ . . . δίχα 'I see an empty dwelling without human beings.' The redundant κενὴν . . . ἀνθρώπων δίχα is emphatic, cf. *OT* 57 ἐρῆμος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω, Campbell, *Essay* 74, §40.1. οἰκησις is an Ionic synonym of Attic οἰκία (cf. *Ant.* 892); it suggests the process of living in a home, of 'dwelling' as both noun and verb.

32 οὐδ' . . . τροφή 'is there not some life-sustaining comfort within of the kind that makes a home'? τροφή includes not only food and drink, but other

basic comforts – e.g. clothing, furniture, and household implements – that support human existence and distinguish a human dwelling from the lair or den of a wild animal.

33 **στιπτή γε . . . τωι** ‘yes, there is a pressed down pile of leaves, as if for someone sleeping within’. γε is often used in both positive and negative answers, in order to register agreement or acknowledgement of what has just been said, before moving on to a new point. It makes the answer more lively and often intensifies it (*GP* 130–1). The word-order and the presence of ὡς (cf. 203) suggest that τωι, the alternate form of τινι, is dat. of interest rather than dat. of agent with στιπτή.

35–7 **αὐτόξυλον . . . τόδε**: nouns ending in -μα are common in Soph. and the other tragic poets; they ‘denote the result of action more frequently than the action itself’ (Long 1968: 18). Here 35 ἐκπωμα, 36 τεχνήματ’ (poetic ‘plural of majesty’, cf. Smyth §1006), and 37 θησαύρισμα are in a high style, in contrast to the humble objects they denote. φλαουρουργοῦ τινος | τεχνήματ’ ἄνδρός is virtually an oxymoron, because of the contradiction between the crude simplicity of the maker of the wooden cup and the artistry implicit in τεχνήματ’.

35 **αὐτόξυλόν γε** ‘made of mere wood’, i.e. crudely whittled rather than the product of artistic workmanship.

36 **πυρεῖ** probably include the stones to which Phil. refers in 296, as well as small bits of kindling. Deictic τόδε at the end of 36 suggests that Ne. holds them aloft for Od. (and the audience) to see, or at least gestures toward them.

37 **κείνου** as the first word of the line is emphatic: ‘this hoard you are signalling is *his*’, i.e. ‘In telling me of this hoard, you give me a token of his existence’ (Campbell). Like 36 τόδε, τόδε indicates some kind of gesture on the part of Od.

θησαύρισμα does not necessarily denote a ‘treasure’, but suggests a substantial ‘store’ of household goods; Od.’s use of the word is probably ironical, given Phil.’s pitifully poor resources.

38–9 **ιοῦ ιοῦ . . . πλέα**: ιοῦ ιοῦ can express or intensify a variety of feelings from joyous surprise (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 25) to sorrow or grief (e.g. *Aj.* 737) to horror-struck recognition (e.g. *Tr.* 1143, *OT* 1071, 1182, Aesch. *Ag.* 1214). Here it conveys the surprise and shock of Ne.’s discovery (cf. 29–39n.).

καί . . . ῥάκη ‘yes, and these things besides (what already was found) are drying out, rags’. ἄλλος and (more rarely) ἕτερος, in the attributive position, can have an appositive force. See Campbell, *Essay* §23.δ.2, Smyth §1272, *SCG* II.275–6. For καί . . . γε ‘yes, and . . .’, see *GP*: 157. ῥάκος denotes a garment or other object made of cloth that has become ragged, tattered, or torn.

βαρείας . . . πλέα ‘full of matter from some heavy sore’, suggesting not only the pus from the painful wound that stains the rags, but also the added weight caused by their soggy condition. In later texts (e.g. Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* 4.88.3, Plu. *Lyc.* 10), νοσηλεία means ‘care of the sick’, ‘nursing’ (cf. Isoc. 19.25 νοσηλεύω), but του νοσηλείας πλέα need not mean ‘infected through ministrations to some grievous sore’ (Campbell), as if the rags are infected by their ‘attendance on’ – their application to

and contact with – Phil.’s diseased foot (cf. 520 *δταν δὲ πλησθῆις τῆς νόσου ξυνουσίαι*).

40 *ἀνὴρ . . . σαφῶς*: *ἀνὴρ* is necessary, because Od. and Ne. are speaking of a specific man, Phil.; cf. 90 *τὸν ἄνδρ’*. *κατοικεῖ*: not merely ‘inhabit’, ‘dwell in’, which would be *οἰκεῖ*, but ‘makes his dwelling in’, ‘settles in’ (LSJ *s.v.* *κατοικέω* 1.2; cf. *κατοικίζω* ‘settle’, ‘colonize’).

41 *κάστ’ . . . ἐκάς που* ‘and doubtless he is not far off’, not ‘and he is somewhere not far off’, given Od.’s *σαφῶς* in the previous line and his intellectual self-confidence.

41–2 *πῶς γὰρ ἄν . . . προσβαίη*: a question, unlike 531–2 *πῶς ἄν . . . γενοίμην*, a wish. *νοσῶν . . . κηρί* ‘a man sick in respect to his foot with an old doom’ (cf. 1166 *κῆρα τάνδ’*). In Homer *κῆρ/κῆρες* denotes a divinity/divinities of death or death as caused by a divinity (e.g. *Il.* 16.687, *Od.* 11.171 = 398 *κῆρ . . . θανάτοιο*, *Il.* 2.302, 834 = 11.332 *κῆρες . . . θανάτοιο*); at Hes. *Th.* 211–12, 217, *Κῆρ* and the *Κῆρες* are children of Night. In tragedy *κῆρ* is regularly used of various kinds of doom, death, and ruin, e.g. *Tr.* 133, 454, Aesch. *Sept.* 777 (the Sphinx), *Ag.* 206. The use of *κηρί* for Phil.’s disease contributes to the sense that his abandonment and isolation on Lemnos constitute a virtual death. Cf. 311n., 622–5n., *Intro.*, pp. 15–16. *προσβαίη* ‘go forward’, ‘advance’. This is the only instance of *προσβαίνω* without an acc. or dat. denoting the obj. toward which the advance is made. *μακράν*, however, an adverbial accusative conveying a sense of direction, makes the absolute use of *προσβαίη* possible. Cf. Radermacher 27, *ad loc.*

43–4 *ἀλλ’ ἢ . . . κάτοιδ’* *που* ‘but he has gone out either on a search for food to bring home, or if he has spotted some pain-soothing herb somewhere’. *νόστον* seems difficult to understand in its usual sense of ‘journey home’. Od., however, clearly considers the cave to be Phil.’s ‘home’ (cf. 32 *οἰκοποιός*, 40 *κατοικεῖ*), and *φορβῆς* is the obj. of *νόστον*, so that the two words together denote a ‘food-journey home’; the presence of *ἐπὶ* ‘tinges *νόστον* with the sense of *ζήτησιν*’ (Jebb), therefore *’πὶ φορβῆς νόστον* can mean ‘on a search for food to bring home’ or, with Campbell, ‘for the purpose of a return with food’ (cf. Fraenkel 1977: 44). Od.’s use of *φορβῆς* (cf. Ne. in 162) is disrespectful and belittling (cf. *Ant.* 775), since *φορβή* usually denotes the food of animals, not humans, e.g. fodder for horses (*Il.* 5.202) and asses (*Il.* 11.562) or birds’ prey (*Aj.* 1065, *Ar.* *Av.* 348). In Xen. *Eq.* 5.1, a *φορβεία* is ‘a halter by which a horse is tied to the manger’ (LSJ *s.v.*). Elsewhere the Chorus and Phil. himself use similar language, not disrespectful but simply to describe his bestial existence; cf. 708, 711, 1108 *φορβάν*, 700 *φορβάδος*, 957 *ἐφερβόμην*, 273, 308 *βορᾶς*. *κάτοιδ’* *που*: *κάτοιδα* can mean ‘know well’, ‘understand’ (553, *Tr.* 87, *Ant.* 1064), but the prefix *κατ-* also can give the word the ingressive sense of ‘get to know by sight’, ‘recognize’ (cf. *Tr.* 418, *OT* 1048). See Renehan 1976: 25–6.

45 *τόν . . . κατασκοπήν* ‘therefore send your attendant to keep watch’. *οὖν* is inferential (*GP* 425). *τόν . . . παρόντα* (cf. *El.* 424) refers to the sailor who entered

with Od. and Ne. at the beginning of the scene, who is referred to in 125 as τὸν σκοπόν, and whom Od. will later send back disguised as a merchant ship's captain (cf. 125–9, 542–627). ἐς (or ἐπὶ) κατασκοπήν is found mainly in prose, perhaps because the subject-matter does not often come up in poetry, but cf. Eur. *Ba.* 838 μολεῖν χρὴ πρῶτον ἐς κατασκοπήν. For προσπεσών suggesting 'a sudden and unforeseen approach' (Jebb), cf. *OC* 1157.

46 ὥς is causal, giving the reason for the preceding statement. Cf. *Aj.* 39; Smyth §2240, *GMT* §§712, 717.

47 ἔλοιτό μ': Buttmann's ἔλοιτ' ἔμ' would provide an appropriate emphasis and be in character for Od. It is not, however, needed, because it is clear from 46 μὴ καὶ λάθῃ με προσπεσών that Od. feels threatened and is the one whom Phil. 'would rather take than all (the rest of) the Argives'. ἔλοιτο here hovers between two meanings: 'choose' and 'take for a prey' (Campbell, *Essay* 66, §36.B.7.2). Such combinations of two senses or constructions are typical of Soph. and help to give his poetry its characteristic richness.

48 ἀλλ' . . . στίβος 'his approach will be guarded against', not, with Σ, 'the path will be guarded'; cf. 2n. For φυλάσσεται, fut. mid. as pass., cf. 303 ξενώσεται, Smyth §§802, 807–8. ἀλλ' ἔρχεται: ἀλλ' expresses 'practical consent', 'willingness to act in a certain way'. Cf. 645 ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ . . . In dialogue, when one character speaks in the imperative (cf. 45 πέμψον), a second character often replies in the future indicative but sometimes in the present, as though he had anticipated or is already fulfilling the command. Cf. *GP* 17. ἔρχεται is used for ἀπέρχεται. The use of simple verbs for compounds, which were more common in everyday Attic, is a characteristic feature of Attic tragedy and one that is parodied by Aristophanes in 'paratragic' passages, e.g. θνήσκω for ἀποθνήσκω at *Ach.* 893–4 and *Thesm.* 865. Cf. 67 βαλεῖς, 277 στήναι, 305 ἔσχε, 893 ἴστω, 1182 μὴ . . . ἔλθῃς. 1233 δοῦναι, 1398 ἦνεσας.

49 εἰ τι χρήζεις: sc. γενέσθαι, cf. *OT* 622. After χρήζω, it is frequently necessary to supply either a complementary inf. (e.g. *OT* 365) or, as here, an inf. to complete a construction of indirect discourse. δευτέρῳ λόγῳ 'in a second discourse', with reference to 24 τὰπίλοιπα τῶν λόγων (cf. 49 φράζε / 25 φράζω). In his Prologues, Soph. frequently ends one section and begins another with one character promising to say or do, or telling another character to say or do, something different: e.g. *Ant.* 37 οὕτως ἔχει σοι ταῦτα, καὶ δείξεις . . ., *El.* 73–4 εἶρηκα μὲν νῦν ταῦτα, σοὶ δ' ἦδη, γέρον, | τὸ σὸν μελέσθω . . . χρέος.

50–99 Now that they have found Phil.'s dwelling and the sailor is watching out for his approach, Od. tells Ne. what he wants him to do. Ne. hesitates, because what Od. commands runs counter to Ne.'s sense of his own inborn nobility. After a brief stichomythia, Od. takes control with a long *rhēsis* (54–85), in effect scripting Ne.'s performance before Phil. as his audience.

50–1 δεῖ σ' . . . | γενναῖον εἶναι 'You must be noble', i.e. 'true to your birth'. Cf. Arist.'s definition of τὸ γενναῖον at *HA* 488b19: τὸ μὴ ἐξιστάμενον ἐκ τῆς

αὐτοῦ φύσεως (see 79, 88–9). Throughout the play, Od. and Ne., when he is carrying out Od.’s orders, rely on impersonal expressions of necessity (δεῖ or χρῆ + acc.-inf., ἀνάγκη + inf., verbal adjs in -τέος, -τέα, -τέον) both to persuade an addressee to do as they say and to evade responsibility for their own words and actions. (Cf. Blundell 1987: 316–17, Schein 1998: 301–5.) Od. implies that Ne. would be truly Achilles’ son if he carries out Od.’s orders, however strange they may seem (cf. 52–3 ἀλλ’ ἦν τι καινόν . . . ὑπουργεῖν). Yet in appealing to Ne. as ‘son of Achilles’ and urging him to be γενναῖον ‘noble’, i.e. to live up to being his father’s son, Od. commands him to do precisely what his father, at least in the *Iliad*, never did or ever would have done – to deceive an opponent with words (55), to lie. In other words, Od. puts Ne. in a position where in order to be the ‘son of Achilles’, he must fail to live up to his father’s standard (cf. Lada-Richards 1998: 15).

50 Ἀχιλλέως παῖς: the second section of the Prologue begins, like the first, with Od. addressing Ne. ingratiatingly as the ‘son of Achilles’ (3/50), as he tries to prepare him for something new and unexpected. ἐφ’ οἷς = ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐφ’ οἷς ‘for these things for which (you have come)’. Od. speaks vaguely, and at this point Ne. seems to know only in the most general way what his task is to be (cf. 90).

51–3 μὴ μόνον . . . πάρει: Od. begins as if he were going to say that Ne. must be noble, i.e. must be of service (ὑπουργεῖν), not only physically but mentally – μὴ μόνον τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ τῇ γνώμῃ – or even verbally – τοῖς λόγοις. Od., however, changes the construction after ἀλλ(ά), in order to make his revelation that Ne. must lie and deceive Phil. seem less blunt and off-putting: ἦν τι καινόν, ὦν πρὶν οὐκ ἀκήκοας, | κλύης is euphemistic. Ne., however, might be troubled by καινόν, which like νέον (cf. 1229 μῶν τι βουλευῆς νέον;) can connote something unexpected, undesirable, suspicious, or even evil, e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 665 καινὰ νέα τ’ ἄχρη, Plato *Ap.* 24c1 δαιμόνια καινά. (LSJ *s.v.* καινός π does not distinguish this sense of the word from that of ‘newly invented’, ‘novel’, but several of the passages it cites clearly have such a connotation. Cf. Σ and Easterling on *Tr.* 867 καὶ τι καινίζει στέγη.) ὦν . . . ἀκήκοας: ὦν = τούτων ἅ. ὑπουργεῖν: inf. with δεῖ σ’, like 51 γενναῖον εἶναι, which in effect ὑπουργεῖν defines. ὥς . . . πάρει: causal ὥς, cf. 46n. On ὑπηρετής, meant like ὑπουργεῖν to put Ne. in his place, see 15n. In military terminology, ὑπηρετής can refer to a lower ranking officer in attendance on a general (e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* 2.4.4, 6.213, cf. Dem. 50.31). Od.’s language, with the repeated ὑπ-, may imply a felt need to assert his own military authority, before revealing to Ne. what he must do.

54 τί δῆτ’ ἄνωγας: ‘what, then, do you command?’ Cf. 100 τί οὖν μ’ ἄνωγας. Ne. acknowledges Od.’s authority curtly and with a touch of impatience. δῆτα frequently reinforces interrogative τί with ‘a logical connective force’ at the beginning of a speech (*GP* 269–70). **Οδ.** τῆν . . . δεῖ: the division of a line among two or more speakers (*antilabē*) expresses a special urgency, excitement, or intensity of feeling. There are thirty instances of *antilabē* in *Ph.*, more than

in any other of Soph.'s surviving plays except *OC*, which has 44 (Kitto 1939: 178). Most occurrences are grouped in a few scenes of 'dramatic excitement' and heightened emotion, as is generally the case in Soph. (Kitto 1939: 178, 180–3, 189–90, Bonaria 1991: 177n. 53): cf. 201, 210; 732, 736, 753–9, 810–17; 974, 981, 985, 994, 1001; 1174, 1182, 1185, 1204, 1210–11; 1296, 1302; 1402–8. In 54 the *antilabē* gives Od.'s abrupt response added force, and an appropriate gesture by the actor playing Ne. would express the youth's surprise at Od.'s interruption within the line.

54–7 τὴν Φιλοκτῆτου . . . οὐχὶ κλεπτέον: the general sense of these lines is clear, but there are two different ways of understanding the syntax and punctuating accordingly. The first of these is more likely, the other just possible:

(i) punctuate with a period (or at least a colon) at the end of 55, and take σε δεῖ with ὅπως ἐκκλέψεις in a rare construction expressing necessity, paralleled only by *Aj.* 556–7 δεῖ σ' ὅπως πατὴρ | δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς οἶος ἐξ οἴου τράφης and Kratinos fr. 115.1–2 *PCG* (from *Nemesis*) δεῖ σ' ὅπως εὐσχήμονος | ἄλεκτρυόνος μηδὲν διοίσεις τοὺς τρόπους; cf. *GMT* §360. Then understand ὅταν . . . πάρει as a subordinate clause in a new sentence and λέγειν (inf. for imper.) as the main verb, introducing a direct statement: 'say, "(I am) the son of Achilles"' (*sc.* εἰμί or πάρειμι); cf. *OT* 460–2, Smyth §2013, *GMT* §784.

(ii) punctuate with a comma at the end of 55, and understand 54–7 as a long sentence with a notable hyperbaton, in which 55–6 are subordinate and quasi-parentetical. This involves taking ὅπως . . . ἐκκλέψεις as a purpose construction (Smyth §2203): 'You must, in order that you may steal . . . when he asks . . . say . . .', with the whole sentence running on to the end of 65.

With (i), the conspicuously abrupt asyndeton at the beginning of 56 is dramatically effective, reinforcing the *antilabē* in 54. The somewhat awkward δεῖ σ' ὅπως . . . ἐκκλέψεις, the three 'musts' in 50–7, and the asyndeton together express Od.'s unease at having to tell the son of Achilles that he must speak lies (λόγοισιν ἐκκλέψεις λέγων) and at the same time constitute Od.'s rhetorical means of doing so. λόγοισιν is instrumental dat. dependent on ἐκκλέψεις, and λέγων is either temporal ('as you go on speaking') or more likely instrumental, reinforcing λόγοισιν ('with words . . . by speaking'). Cf. Od.'s emphasis on verbal effectiveness (64–5, 98–9) and Phil.'s fear of λόγων καλῶν (1268–9).

55 ψυχὴν . . . ἐκκλέψεις 'that you secretly (ἐκ-) deceive Phil.'s mind', but also 'that you . . . steal Phil.'s life' by stealing his means of staying alive, the bow. Cf. the play on βίος and βιός in 1282. κλέπτω and its compounds mean, in the first place, 'steal', but are often used of deceit (*El.* 56, Aesch. *Ch.* 854), self-deceit (*Ant.* 681, *Tr.* 243), concealment (57, 968), cheating (*Tr.* 436–7, *Il.* 1.131–2 μή . . . | κλέπτε νόω), and clandestine or treacherous action (*Aj.* 188 κλέπτουσι μύθους, 1137 λάθραι σὺ κλέψιας κακά, *El.* 37 δόλοισι κλέψαι . . . σφαγὰς). See LSJ *s.v.*, Denniston on Eur. *El.* 364.

56 for τε καί at positions 7–8, i.e. at the end of the first colon of the line and the beginning of the second, when the caesura is at position 7, see *Ant.* 181, 513, *OT* 528; for τε καί at positions 5–6, when the caesura is at position 5, see 48, *OC*

113, 494; for τε at the end of one line and καί at the beginning of the next, cf. *Tr.* 234–5 ἰσχύοντά τε | καὶ ζῶντα.

57 λέγειν: inf. for imper., cf. 1411. τόδ' . . . κλεπτέον 'there must be no deceit in *this*'. τόδ', emphatic at the beginning of the line, is internal acc. with impersonal κλεπτέον, cf. 994 πειστέον τόδε. This is simpler than supplying σοι as dat. of agent and taking τόδ' as subject of κλεπτέον (ἐστί), 'you must not conceal *this*'.

58 πλεῖς . . . οἶκον 'but you are sailing as for home'. Od. moves smoothly into a lively *rhapsis*, providing the words Ne. should use, as if Ne. were already speaking. ὥς 'as for' indicates the speaker's intent (Smyth §2996).

59 ἔχθος ἔχθήρας μέγα: ἔχθος . . . μέγα is internal acc., with αὐτούς to be supplied as direct obj., 'having come to hate them with a great hatred'. The omission of the direct obj. is emphatic, strengthening Ne.'s expression of indignation. For inclusion of the direct obj., cf. *El.* 1034 οὐδ' αὖ τοσοῦτον ἔχθος ἔχθαίρω σ' ἐγώ.

60 οἷ is causal, referring back to αὐτούς supplied as direct obj. of 59 ἔχθήρας: 'having come to hate them with a great hatred *because* they did not . . .'. Cf. 663, 1386 with Smyth §2555, Moorhouse 273, K–G II.175–6. ἐν λιταῖς: instrumental dat. with ἐν, cf. 102 ἐν δόλω. This construction becomes more frequent in fourth-century and Hellenistic Greek and is common in the κοινή. Λίται are usually addressed to a god, e.g. *Ant.* 1019–20, *El.* 137–9 (to Agamemnon as a chthonic divinity), *OC* 1010–12, 1557–8, but cf. 495 below.

στέλλαντες . . . μολεῖν: here στέλλω = μεταστέλλω 'summon', cf. *Ant.* 164–5 ὅμῃς δ' ἐγὼ πόμποισιν ἐκ πάντων δίχα | ἔσταιλ' ἰκέσθαι (LSJ *s.v.* στέλλω IIIa). The primary meaning of στέλλω (LSJ *s.v.* I) is 'make ready', 'prepare', as in 1077. When transitive, it can mean 'bring', 'convey' (623, 983), 'cause another to set forth or depart' (911), and, in the mid. and pass., 'make oneself set forth or depart' (466, 1416). Cf. intransitive στέλλω 'set forth', 'depart' (571, 640).

61 μόνην . . . Ἰλίου 'because they had this as their only means of taking Ilium'. Seyffert's insertion of γ' after μόνην, accepted by most recent editors, is apt but unnecessary. Though γε, like δή, often follows and intensifies words denoting number, amount, or size (*GP* 120), here μόνην is already emphatic by its prominent position at the beginning of the line and its separation from ἄλωσιν, with which it agrees. Cf. 113 αἰρεῖ τὰ τόξα ταῦτα τὴν Τροίαν μόνα, *Tr.* 313, *OT* 837. Elsewhere in the play, μόνος usually describes the 'solitary' Phil. (172, 183, 227, 470, 688, 809, 954). τήνδε refers to the idea in 60 of 'causing' Ne. 'to set forth from home', but it is attracted from the neuter into agreement with ἄλωσιν. Cf. 1n.

62–3 οὐκ . . . αἰτουμένωι 'did not think you worthy of the arms of Achilles – to give them to you when you had come and were asking for them as their (rightful) lord and master'. The syntax results from the combination of two ideas: (1) οὐκ ἤξιωσάν σε τῶν Ἀχιλλεῖων ὅπλων 'they did not think you worthy of the arms of Achilles', and (2) οὐκ ἤξιωσάν σοι δοῦναι τὰ ὅπλα 'they did not think it

right to give you the arms'. κυρίως modifies αἰτουμένῳ and is used in a quasi-legal sense: Ne. seeks the arms as Achilles' son and heir and their rightful lord and master (LSJ *s.v.* κύριος II.1.2).

64 Ὀδυσσεῖ παρέδωσαν: Od. tells Ne. to use his name, knowing how that will anger Phil. and help to win his trust. παραδίδωμι 'hand over', 'surrender' can connote treachery or betrayal (LSJ *s.v.* 2), cf. 399. Mythological details known from the *Little Iliad* suggest, without explicitly stating, that Od., though awarded the arms of Achilles in competition with Ajax, gave them to Ne., and that Ne.'s claim to have been betrayed in this respect is part of the false story Od. instructs him to tell Phil. Cf. Pucci 165.

64–5 λέγων... κακά: there is anacolouthon after ἀλλ' αὐτ' Ὀδυσσεῖ παρέδωσαν. λέγων refers back to 55 ἐκκλέψεις λέγων and agrees grammatically with 'you', the implied subj. of 57 λέγειν. καθ' ἡμῶν 'against me', the so-called 'plural of modesty', which often is found when there is interchange of first-person sing. and plur. verbs or pronouns, here 65 ἡμῶν, 66 μ'. Cf. 404–5, 1393–4; Smyth §1008, *SCG* 1.53, Moorhouse 8–9. ἔσχατ' ἐσχάτων κακά 'the most extreme of extreme evils'. Cf. *OT* 465 ἄρρητ' ἀρρήτων, *OC* 1238 κακὰ κακῶν. The gen. is partitive (Moorhouse: 58). ἔσχατον suggests a limit beyond which it is impossible to go.

66 τούτῳ... μ' ἀλγυνεῖς 'for by this you will cause me no pain at all'. Most editors rightly accept Buttmann's τούτῳ (instrumental dat.) for the MSS' τούτων (part. gen. after the internal acc. οὐδέν). ἀλγυνεῖς, the reading of most MSS, is much more likely than the variant ἀλγυνεῖ, given ἐργάσῃ at the end of the line.

66–7 εἰ δ' ἐργάσῃ | μὴ ταῦτα 'if you *don't* do this'. The postponed μὴ is emphatic, cf. *OT* 328, *El.* 654, 992–3, *OC* 1365; see Campbell, *Essay* 78, §41.γ.b, Bruhn §169. For μὴ as the first word of a line, negating a word in the previous line, cf. *OT* 347–8, *OC* 1348–9. For the combination of hyperbaton and enjambment, cf. 3–4, 77–8.

67 βαλεῖς is used for ἐμβαλεῖς or προσβαλεῖς, cf. *Tr.* 916, *Eur. Pho.* 1534–5. In poetry the simple dat. rather than the dat. or acc. with a prep. sometimes denotes an object at or against which an action is directed. Cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 1232, Campbell, *Essay* §55.4, Moorhouse 80–1. For the simple verb in place of a compound, see 48n.

68 τὰ... τόξα: τόξα can mean bow, arrows, or both together. This is the first explicit mention of Phil.'s weapon, with which, from this point on in the Prologue, Od. is 'constantly preoccupied as though it provides the sole reason of his mission (68, 78, 113, 115)' (Seale 1982: 30; cf. Linforth 1956: 103). The bow (and arrows) will be present throughout the play both verbally and as visible, symbolic objects, like Ajax's sword (cf. Segal 1981: 116–18, 318–22) or the crown in Shakespeare's *Richard II*. Od.'s reference to the bow raises the much-debated question of whether it alone is needed for the conquest of Troy or Phil. himself must be present. At 90–1, 112, 196–200 Ne. speaks as if he knows that Phil. must

wield the bow at Troy, but Phil. is not explicitly mentioned. Cf. Visser 1998. **μη ληφθήσεται:** the fut. indic. pass. is rare in tragedy and more emphatic than the pres.

69 τὸ . . . πέδον means the territory surrounding Troy as well as the walled city, cf. 920 τὰ Τροίας πεδία πορθῆσαι, 1435 ἐλεῖν τὸ Τροίας πεδίον, *OC* 380–1 τὸ Καδμείων πέδον | τιμῇ καθέξων. σοι (enclitic) gains emphasis as the final syllable of πέρσαι σοι, in effect a three-syllable word ending at position 6 (middle caesura); cf. 446, 101n. With this metrical emphasis, the accented, as opposed to the enclitic, pronoun is unnecessary and might weaken the effect of σοι in the following line. σοι is grammatically dependent on οὐκ ἔστι at the beginning of the line. For the present tense used of future time, cf. 113, 117, *OT* 159, *OC* 1421; Smyth §1879, *GMT* §32, *SCG* 1.83.

70–6 Od. justifies ordering Ne. to deceive Phil. on the ground that he himself would be recognized, with dire consequences for both himself and Ne. In Aesch.’s *Philoktetes*, Od. was neither disguised nor recognized by Phil.; in Eur.’s *Philoktetes*, Athena disguised Od. so that Phil. could not recognize him, until after the bow had been stolen. See *Intro.*, pp. 5, 6.

70–1 ἐμοὶ μὲν . . . σοὶ δ’ . . . anticipates Ne.’s possible objection to being told to deceive Phil., ‘Why me and not you?’ For ὥς . . . βέβαιος, an indirect question preceding ἐκμαθε on which it is dependent, cf. 1359–60 οἷα . . . ἔτι preceding δοκῶ προλεύσσειν. ὁμιλία . . . βέβαιος ‘a trustworthy and safe association with this man’.

ὁμιλία need not mean ‘conversation’, but can denote social intercourse more generally. For ὁμιλία πρὸς, cf. Plato *Symp.* 203a3. Here and in *Tr.* 621, Soph. treats βέβαιος as an adj. of two endings (-ος, -ον), but in fr. 201d (from *Eriphyle*) as having three endings (-ος, -η, -ον). Eur. employs βέβαιος within a single play as an adj. of two endings (Eur. *El.* 941) and of three (Eur. *El.* 1263). The only examples of the word in Aesch. are masc. or neut., so it is impossible to know whether it should be thought of as having two or three endings. Most adjectives of two endings are compounds, with a prefix such as ἄ-, ἐπι-, εὐ-, or ὑπ-; adjectives with separate masculine and feminine forms in poetry sometimes have only two endings in prose. Thus βέβαιος is always an adj. of two endings in Thuc. and Plato. Cf. K–B 1.535–40.

71 ἐκμαθε ‘learn fully’, cf. 55 ἐκκλέψεις, 79 ἔξειδα, 13–4n., 79n., *Intro.*, p. 32.

72–3 σὺ μὲν . . . στόλου ‘you have sailed (sc. to Troy) neither bound by oath to anyone nor by compulsion nor as part of the first expedition’. Σ comments, ‘All the Greeks swore to [Helen’s father] Tyndareus to unite as allies, if Helen should be carried off.’ Cf. fr. 144.1–2 (from Ἀχαιῶν Σύλλογος [*The Gathering of the Achaeans*]) σὺ . . . γραμμῶν πτύχας ἔχων | νέμ’ εἴ τις οὐ πάρεστιν δς ξυνώμοσεν, apparently referring to a list of those who swore the oath. ἐξ

ἀνάγκης recalls the story, known from the *Kypria* (*Argumentum*, Bernabé 40; West 2003: 70–1) that Od. had pretended to be mad, but was compelled to join the expedition, when Palamedes tricked him into revealing his sanity. Cf. 1025 with 1025–8n. τοῦ . . . στόλου: partitive gen., cf. fr. 555.1 ἧ ποντοναῦται

τῶν ταλαιπώρων βροτῶν, Smyth §1319, K–G π.342–3. Renehan 1992: 369–70 suggests that τοῦ πρώτου στόλου is based on military language, comparing Lys. 14.11 ἓάν τις τῆς πρώτης τάξεως τεταγμένος τῆς δευτέρας γένηται, Lys. 16.15, Isoc. 12.180. Od.’s three οὔτε phrases culminate rhetorically in the real reason for his insistence – that Phil would not recognize Ne., because Ne. was not part of the first expedition.

74 ἐμοί: dat. of agent with ἀρνήσιμον, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον with virtually the force of a verbal adj. in -τέον.

75–6 εἰ με... ξυνών: the fut. indic. with εἰ in the protasis (‘emotional future condition’) is even more vivid and emphatic than the subjunct. with ἓάν would be. Usually the apodosis of such a condition also has the fut. indic., but other primary tenses are possible. In 76 both constructions are present: (‘if he will perceive me...’) I am lost and I will destroy you in addition, since I am with (you)’ (ξυνών = ἐπειδάν σοι ξυνῶ). The fut. indic. with εἰ is especially common when the protasis suggests something feared, not wished for, or a threat that is ‘intended independently of the speaker’s will’, and the apodosis conveys ‘a threat, a warning, or an earnest appeal to the feelings’ (Smyth §2328). τόξων ἐγκρατής: sc. ὤν. Cf. *Ant.* 715–16 ναὸς ἐγκρατῇ πόδα | τείνας ‘stretching the sheet (= ‘rope’), so that it has command of the ship’.

77 ἀλλ’... σοφισθῆναι ‘but you must be clever in this very thing’, cf. 11–14n. ἀλλ’ breaks off from the warning in 76, recurs to 55 ἐκκλέψεις and 57 κλεπτέον, and looks forward to κλοπεύς | ὅπως γενήσῃ. σοφισθῆναι is aor. pass. with mid. force. αὐτὸ τοῦτο is internal acc. with σοφισθῆναι and may be colloquial (cf. Stevens 1976: 27, Collard 2005: 362).

77–8 κλοπεύς | ... γενήσῃ: cf. *OT* 721 φονέα γενέσθαι πατρός, *OC* 582 ὅταν... σύ μου ταφεὺς γένηι. For the combination of hyperbaton and enjambment, cf. 3–14, 66–7. The enjambment calls attention to κλοπεύς at the end of the enjambed line, cf. 13–14 τὸ πᾶν | σόφισμα with 13–4n.

79–85 Od. appeals to Ne. to repress his inborn nature and bring himself ‘to contrive evils’ ‘for a small part of a day, for a shameful purpose’ (80–3). These lines are echoed in Phil.’s appeal to Ne. at 473–80 to put up with the ‘toil of not one whole day’ and bring him to ‘the Oitaian land’ (479–80). Here Od., in sophistic language, emphasizes the need ‘to say such things and contrive evils’, in order to ‘appear just’ and be called ‘most pious’ (80–5). In 473–80, Phil. argues that for someone with Ne.’s inherited nobility, ‘that which is shameful is detestable’ (476), but the ‘prize’ (478 γέρας) for living up to his nobility and acting well (476–8 τὸ χρηστὸν... δρᾶσαντι) is the glory of hearing oneself well spoken of (476 εὐκλεές, 478 εὐκλείας). Both Od., with calculated smoothness, and Phil., with spontaneous urgency, introduce their respective attempts at persuasion with a reassuring ‘I know well’ (79 ξῶοιδα/474 ξῶοιδα), intended to make Ne. feel that he is understood and thus more willing to ‘endure’ the course of action being urged on him (82 τόλμα/475 τλήθι, 481 τόλμησον). Cf. Kirkwood 1958: 243–4n.23.

79 **ἔξοδα**: for the prefix ἐκ- ‘well’, ‘fully’, ‘thoroughly’, see 13–14n. **παῖ**: Erfurdt’s emendation rightly restores Od.’s ingratiating effort to establish a symbolic father-son relationship with Ne., even while referring to the ‘nature’ that Ne. inherited from Achilles. Cf. 130 τέκνον, when Od. is confident that he has seduced Ne. into helping to deceive Phil. Phil., on the other hand, calls Ne. παῖ or τέκνον 52 times in the play (Avery 1965: 285), and in the end Phil. wins what amounts to a competition with Od. to be an appropriate father-figure for Ne. **φύσει . . . πεφυκότα**: φύσει adds emphasis to πεφυκότα, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 895–6 τό τ’ ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ νόμιμον | αἰὲ φύσει τε πεφυκός, Antiph. *Soph.* 44 v ii 10 D–K ἐπεὶ φύσει πάντα πάντες πεφύκαμεν. See Bruhn §231. οὐ is normal in indirect discourse, but ἐπίσταμαι and οἶδα (and their cognates), when denoting ‘confident belief’, may take μή instead of οὐ, e.g. *OC* 656 οἶδ’ ἐγὼ σε μή τινα | ἐνθὺνδ’ ἀπάξοντ’ ἀνδρα. See Smyth §2730, *GMT* §688, K–G II.203. φύσις, especially the φύσις of Ne., is a central concern of the play (e.g. 88–9, 874, 902, 1310–11), closely linked with its focus on Ne.’s education into his inborn ‘nobility’ (e.g. 51, 180, 336, 799, 801, 874, 1068, 1402). Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.72 γένοι’, οἶος ἔσσι μισθῶν, Weinstock 1931: 96, Blundell 1988. φύσει . . . πεφυκότα is as suited to Ne.’s character as 55 λόγοισιν . . . λέγων is to Od.’s.

80 **φωνεῖν . . . τεχνᾶσθαι**: for the ‘object inf.’ after πεφυκότα (cf. 88, 1052), see *GMT* §749, K–G II.11, Bruhn §126.2; τεχνᾶσθαι ‘contrive’ (cf. *Ant.* 494 τῶν μηδὲν ὀρθῶς . . . τεχνωμένων) and 88 τέχνης belong to the same world of sophistic diction as 14 σόφισμα, 77 σοφισθῆναι, 119 σοφός, 131 τὰ συμφέροντα. Cf. 14n., Aesch. *PV* 506 with Griffith’s note, Plato *Prot.* 321d1 τὴν ἔντεχνον σοφίαν.

81–5 Od. completes his *rhet̃sis* with an ethically provocative exhortation to Ne. to surrender himself temporarily to the intrigue against Phil.

81–2 **ἀλλ’ . . . τόλμα** ‘but – for the possession of victory is a sweet thing to obtain – bring yourself (to lie and contrive evils)’. ἀλλά and γάρ often work together, but here they have separate functions; cf. 1020, *GP* 98–9. With ἀλλ’, Od. breaks off from his first-person statement about Ne. in 79–80 and addresses him directly in the second person: τόλμα. The words between ἀλλ’ and τόλμα are parenthetical, and postpositive γάρ indicates that the parenthesis offers an explanation of what is being said in the clause that it interrupts. Such parentheses are common in *Soph.* and can give his poetry an almost conversational liveliness; cf. 144, 371, 938. τῆς νίκης is gen. of definition, clarifying the meaning of κτῆμα (Moorhouse 53, Smyth §§1290–1, 1295); λαβεῖν is epexegetical inf., explaining the predicate nominative ἦδ’ . . . τι (cf. K–G II.576–7, Bruhn §127).

82 **δίκαιοι . . . ἐκφανούμεθα**: *sc.* ὄντες rather than εἶναι, since φαίνομαι ὦν = ‘I seem to be (and I really am)’, and φαίνομαι εἶναι = ‘I seem to be (but I may not really or truly be)’; cf. Smyth §2143. Od. wants Ne. to accept his own ethical position, that justice is not a moral absolute but a name given to a particular kind of behaviour or speech, which can change from time to time, and that in the future our way of acting will be shown to be just. Thus Od. is characterized by ‘moral relativism’ and opportunism, but not by pure cynicism. Cf. 1049–51 with 1049–53n. Od. uses the first person plural, as he uses the dual in

25 and 133, to associate Ne. more closely with himself. ἐκφανοῦμεθα is not merely ‘appear’ but ‘be revealed’, ‘shine out’. αὖθις ‘another time’, ‘afterwards’ (LSJ s.v. II.3).

83 νῦν δ’ stands in contrast to αὖθις and is already implicit in 82 τόλμα. εἰς . . . βραχὺ ‘for a shameless purpose, for a brief part of a day’. μέρος βραχὺ is acc. of duration of time. εἰς is frequently used with a purpose as its object (LSJ s.v. v.2, Smyth §1686d), cf. 111 εἰς κέρδος, Eur. *Pho.* 395 ἀλλ’ ἐς τὸ κέρδος παρὰ φύσιν δουλευτέον with Mastronarde’s note. For the rare neut. adj. as a substantive without the def. article, cf. *OT* 1312 ἐς δεινόν, οὐδ’ ἀκουστόν, οὐδ’ ἐπόψιμον, Thuc. 5.18.4 δικαίωι χρήσθων καὶ ὄρκοις, Moorhouse 163. In effect ἀναιδὲς stands for ἀναιδὲς τι or ἀναιδεία. This interpretation is preferable to taking ἀναιδὲς as an adj. parallel to βραχὺ and modifying μέρος, but understood as equivalent to ἀναιδοῦς, i.e. transferred from ἡμέρας to μέρος by hypallage (cf. *Ani.* 793–4 νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν | ξύναιμον with Griffith’s comment, Smyth §3027). In the latter construction, ἐς would mark a limit of time, as in 1076–7 χρόνον τοσοῦτον εἰς ὅσον τά τ’ ἐκ νεῶς | στείλωσι ναῦται (cf. Smyth §2383C., n.).

Od.’s reference to ‘a brief part of a day’ (within the play) needed for the intrigue against Phil. reflects the self-conscious dramatic design with which he directs Ne. in what amounts to a ‘staged’ performance for the benefit of Phil. This kind of ‘metatheatricality’ is most apparent in Od.’s ‘scripting’ of the stories that Ne. will tell Phil. (56–67) and the False Merchant will tell both Phil. and Ne. (130–1, 542–627). Cf. 542–627n. (One day is the norm for the action of an Attic tragedy, as can be seen in nearly all the extant plays of Soph. and Eur. Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 5.1449b13 ὑπὸ μίαν περίοδον ἡλίου.)

84 δός μοι σεαυτόν: the same phrase occurs at *Tr.* 1117, where the speaker similarly tries to persuade his interlocutor to act against his natural inclination; it is probably colloquial (Stevens 1945: 104, Blundell 1989: 185n.7, Collard 2005: 369–70) and also may signal, for an Athenian audience, the kind of self-surrender associated with initiation into mystery cults and suggest that Ne. in the course of the play should be seen as undergoing an initiatory passage into manhood (cf. Lada-Richards 1998: 3–4 *et passim*). κᾶτα . . . χρόνον: crasis of καί and εἶτα, introducing an imper. in rhetorical contrast to 83–4 ἡμέρας μέρος βραχὺ | δός μοι σεαυτόν. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 1247–9 ἀλλὰ τήνδε γε | λαθοῦ βραχέϊαν ἡμέραν παίδων σέθεν / κᾶπειτα θρήνει.

85 κέκλησο . . . βροτῶν: κέκλησο is second person, perf. mid.-pass. imper.: ‘call yourself’, ‘be called’; cf. 119, *Tr.* 736 κεκληῖσθαι, *El.* 366 κεκληῖσθαι. Od. manipulates moral language for his own ends, suggesting that as justice or injustice is a way of behaving and of using language (cf. 82), so piety is a matter of what one is called. For his amoral opportunism, cf. 1050–1, Blundell 1987: 317–22.

86–95 In response to Od.’s long *rhēsis*, Ne. expresses his reluctance either to act in a ‘cunning’, ‘evil’ way, which would be out of keeping with his inherited ‘nature’, or to disobey Od., with whom he has been sent to cooperate. Ne.’s response recalls Achilles’ long speech to Odysseus at *Il.* 9.308–429, rejecting Agamemnon’s offer of gifts; Σ on 94 comments, ‘Soph. brings him on speaking his

father's speech, ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Αἶδαο... (Il. 9.312). Nevertheless, though Ne. 'believes himself to be so independent' in living up to his inborn excellence, 'in reality he is... merely youthful material that can be manipulated first by Odysseus, then by Philoktetes' (Reinhardt 1979: 166).

86 ἐγὼ μὲν 'I, for my part': μὲν emphasizes ἐγὼ, in implicit contrast to Od., but there is no antithetical σὺ δέ. Cf. 1, GP. 381. The actual rhetorical contrast is between Ne.'s reluctance to act in accordance with words he hates to hear (86–7) and his readiness to use force and not deceit (90–1).

86–7 οὓς ἄν... στυγῶ 'whatever (of) words I feel pain hearing, son of Laertes, these I hate actually to put into practice'. οὓς is dir. obj. of κλύων and governs the partitive gen. τῶν λόγων (cf. 24 τὰπίλοιπα τῶν λόγων), while ἀλγῶ is intransitive, as in OC 420 ἀλγῶ κλύουσα ταῦτα. It also would be possible to take οὓς as dir. obj. of ἀλγῶ (cf. Aj. 790 πρᾶξιν ἦν ἡλγησ' ἐγὼ), and κλύων as an intransitive supplementary participle (cf. Aesch. Pers. 844 ἡλγησ' ἀκούσας... πῆματα, Hdt. 3.50 ἡλγησε ἀκούσας οὕτως ὥστε...). Normally πράσσειν and τοὺς λόγους would be in opposition (cf. 96–9, Ant. 688–9), but the 'action' which Od. wishes Ne. to undertake is itself a matter of (false) speech. There is no precise parallel for λόγους πράσσειν 'to put words into practice', but speech and 'any kind of action' (πανουργίας) are linked in 407–9, cf. 633–4. See too Thuc. 3.38.3, where Kleon calls the Athenians in the assembly θεαταὶ μὲν λόγων..., ἀκροαταὶ δὲ τῶν ἔργων.

88–9 Ne. is proud of his inherited nature, which, he assumes, has an inborn essence that cannot be brought by instrumentalist indoctrination to 'act through evil contrivance', cf. 79n. πράσσειν is object inf. after ἔφυν, cf. 80n. For ἐκ- 'through', 'by means of', see 73, 563, 710, 945, 985; cf. 1422 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τῶνδ' 'through and as a result of these toils'.

90 πρὸς βίαν... ἄγειν: ἄγειν is object inf., dependent on ἔτοιμος. Violence, especially the violence of Od. and Ne. against Phil., is an important motif in the play: cf. 92, 103 πρὸς βίαν, 594 πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος, 983 βίαι στελοῦσι, 1297 βίαι. ἐκ βίας... ἄγειν (563, 945, 985) is an expression unique to this play, and ἡ... Ὀδυσσέως βία (314, 321, 592) is a naming circumlocution of a kind paralleled in Soph. only at Tr. 38. Cf. Garvie 1972: 218, Blundell 1987: 327, Schein 2002, Introd., p. 21. τὸν ἄνδρ': cf. 40 ἄνθρωπος.

91 καὶ μὴ δόλοισιν: in contrast to 90, 92 πρὸς βίαν. Ne. speaks more bluntly than Od. in 55. μὴ is used instead of οὐ (1) because it is generic ('by such means as are not frauds', Jebb; cf. Smyth §2735), (2) because, going with ἄγειν, it implies μὴ ἄγω (subjunct.), and (3) because it follows a phrase indicating strong resolve (Campbell 1907: 197–8, Moorhouse 326) and a verb denoting confident belief (cf. 79n.). γάρ '(and we should be able to bring him by force) for... (GP 61).

ἐξ ἐνὸς ποδός lit. 'from one foot', i.e. when he can rely on, make use of, only one foot. Cf. 88 ἐκ τέχνης... κακῆς with 88–9n., Tr. 875 ἐξ ἀκινήτου ποδός with Easterling's n., OC 848 ἐκ τοῦτοις γε... σκήπτροισιν.

92 τοσούσδε: *sc.* ὄντας.

93 πεμφθείς γε... ξυνεργάτης 'since, however, I have been sent as your fellow worker'. γε intensifies the force of πεμφθείς, and γε μέντοι together are adversative, cf. 1052, *GP* 412. ξυνεργάτης is found elsewhere only at Eur. *Hipp.* 417, *Bacch.* 1146; cf. Eur. *El.* 100 συνεργάτιν. By using this word, Ne. implies that he is on an equal footing with Od., who earlier spoke of him somewhat disparagingly as his 'servant' (15, 53). If Ne. thought of himself as a servant, he presumably would not say that he 'hesitate[s] to be called a traitor' (93–4), but that he hesitates to disobey his master. συν- / ξυν- is common as a prefix in Soph., often in ἀπαξ λεγόμενα that he may himself have coined, e.g. 550 συννεναυστοληκότες, 565 ξυνναυβάται, 1453 ξύμφρουρον.

94 προδότης: the resolved *anceps* at position 1 of the trimeter is unusual, but there are roughly twice as many such resolutions in *Ph.* (21) as in any other of Soph.'s surviving plays (cf. Schein 1979: 78, Table xxxi). Here the resolution may reflect Ne.'s feeling at even the thought of being called a 'traitor'.

94–5 βούλομαι... κακῶς: cf. Eur. *Andr.* 777–80 κρεῖσσον δὲ νίκαν μὴ κακόδοξον ἔχειν | ἢ ξὺν φθόνῳ σφάλλιν δυνάμει τε δίκαν. Ne. speaks of νίκαν κακῶς (pres. tense) as an ongoing action, but of ἐξαμαρτεῖν (aor.) as a unique, one-time event. He ends his speech respectfully (ἄναξ), but with a clear contrast between his own straightforward nobility and ethical simplicity and Od.'s devious opportunism and emphasis on winning at all costs – a contrast driven home by the rhyming of καλῶς with κακῶς.

96–9 Od. concludes the second part of the Prologue with a brief, worldly wise rejoinder to Ne.'s declaration of inborn, natural integrity. He begins by once again seeming to confirm Ne.'s sense of his ethical heritage (96 ἔσθλοῦ πατρὸς παῖ, cf. 3, 50, 57, 79), even while identifying his own youthful self with the son of Achilles (96 καὺτὸς ὦν νέος ποτὲ). Then he goes on to claim that experience of the world has taught him that his own domain of excellence, 'speech', rather than that of Achilles and Ne., 'action', 'leads the way in all things for mortals'. Od.'s language calls to mind the power of (persuasive) speech in late fifth-century Athenian assemblies and jury trials; Σ on 99 comments that (in Od.'s lines) Soph. 'slanders (διαβάλλει) contemporary Athenian political leaders (ῥήτορας) as succeeding in all things through speech' (ὥς διὰ γλώσσης πάντα κατορθοῦντας). Cf. 407–9, where Phil. says disparagingly that Od. 'would apply his tongue to every evil speech and every villainy by which he might achieve an end that is in no way just' (cf. 86–7n., 633–4). Cf. Eur. *Trö.* 285–8, where Hekabe speaks of Odysseus as one 'who twists everything from that side to this, | and then back again to that | with his twofold tongue | making what was formerly loved unloved'. In general, the representation of Od. in *Ph.* resembles that in Eur. *Hec.*, where he is a speaking character, in Eur. *Trö.* and *IA*, in which he is referred to but does not appear, and in [Eur.] *Rh.*, especially in the positive value he gives to the tongue over other parts of the body and to speech over action. Cf. Eur. *Or.* 1403–6; Worman 2008: 52–5. Od.'s words in 96–9 also recall the description

of Euripides in *Ar. Ran.* 826–7 as στοματοουργὸς ἐπὼν βασανίστρια λίσπη | γλῶσσ’ ἀνελισσομένη ‘the smooth tongue unfurling, mouth-working | tester of words’ (trans. J. Henderson), who at *Ran.* 892 prays to Γλώττης Στρόφιγξ ‘Pivot of Tongue’. Cf. Worman 2008: 105. In tragedy and Greek thought generally, speech is usually contrasted unfavourably to action e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 1187–8 οὐκ ἐχρῆν ποτε | τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν γλῶσσαν ἰσχύειν πλέον. For other negative judgements of speech, cf. *OC* 806–7 γλῶσσηι σὺ δεινός· ἀνδρα δ’ οὐδέν’ οἶδ’ ἐγὼ | δίκαιον ὅστις ἐξ ἀπαντος εὖ λέγει, Eur. *Bacch.* 268–9 σὺ δ’ εὐτροχὸν μὲν γλῶσσαν ὡς φρονῶν ἔχεις, | ἐν τοῖς λόγοισι δ’ οὐκ ἔννευσί σοι φρένες.

96 καὐτός... ποτέ: cf. Plato’s description of his own, rather different political innocence, at *Ep.* 7.324b8 νέος ἐγὼ ποτε ὦν πολλοῖς δὴ ταῦτόν ἔπαθον... Plato’s irony, however, is at his own expense, Od.’s at the expense of Ne.

97 γλῶσσαν... ἐργάτιν: ‘idle tongue’ vs. ‘active hand’ is an effective double antithesis.

98 εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιών ‘as I go forth to the test’, i.e. to testing in adult life the youthful maxim implied in 97, that the hand should be active and the tongue idle. Od.’s first-person verbs (εἶχον, ὁρῶ) may also imply that he himself is being tested, not only the maxim. For ‘going forth to the test’, cf. *TGrF* 2, fr. *adespot.* F 1 c = *Soph.* fr. 105F.2–3 γένος γὰρ εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιών καλὸν | εὐκλειαν ἂν κτήσαιο μάλλον ἢ φόγον, Eur. *Alc.* 640 ἐδειξας εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξελθὼν ὃς εἴ. βροτοῖς is dat. of reference, ‘denot[ing] the person in whose opinion a statement holds good’ (Smyth §1496).

100–34 The third main section of the prologue consists of twenty-three lines of emotionally intense *stichomythia*, in which Od. convinces Ne. to lie and deceive Phil., followed by a twelve-line speech in which Od. sets his plot in motion and prepares the way for the later scene with the False Merchant.

100–22 The *stichomythia* is the first of four such exchanges in the play: the others are at 974–1003 (Od. and Phil.), 1222–60 (Od. and Ne.), 1373–1408 (Ne. and Phil.). In 100–22, Ne.’s first eight lines are questions. Od.’s responses lead Ne. to give way in 116 and agree that lying to Phil. is necessary – an agreement made definitive in 120. As often in *stichomythia*, the dialogue is somewhat elliptical, with words supplied and grammatical constructions continued from one line to the next (e.g. in 105, 109, 122), as one speaker throws words and ideas back at the other (e.g. 100 λέγειν/101 λέγω, 101 δόλωι/102 δόλωι, 102 πείσαντ’/103 πίθηται, 108 ψευδῇ/109 ψεύδος, 111 κέρδος/112 κέρδος). The passage is framed by metrically identical, rhyming words at line end in 100–2 (λέγειν-λαβεῖν-ἄγειν) and 121–2 (παρήνεσσα-συνήνεσα). Cf. Goldhill 2012: 63–73, esp. 63–8.

100 τί... ἀνωγας echoes 54 τί δῆτ’ ἀνωγας, but now Ne. understands what Od. actually meant by 50–1 δεῖ... | γενναῖον εἶναι. Wakefield’s τί μ’ οὖν aims to eliminate hiatus after τί, but this is unnecessary: cf. τί οὖν at Aesch. *Supp.* 306, *Eum.* 902, Eur. *Hec.* 820, Sommerstein on *Eum.* 902 (add Eur. *Telephos* fr. 727a.52 to his examples). πλὴν... λέγειν: as in 91 δόλοισιν, so here Ne. bluntly

calls a spade a spade: $\varphi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$. Usually the article is not omitted when the inf. follows a prep., but for $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$ followed by the inf. alone, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 125, 737; see *GMT* §803, Smyth §2966b).

101 $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ldots\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is a metrically anomalous and forceful line, one of four iambic trimeters in the play (cf. 737, 1064, 1369) and fourteen in the seven extant plays of Sophokles which have an unelided polysyllabic word ending at position 6, without a monosyllable at position 7 ('middle caesura'). Cf. *Introd.*, pp. 37–8. In these metrically bisected lines the word-ending at position 6, here $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega\iota$, is particularly conspicuous and emphatic. The rare sequence of three consecutive, iambic-shaped words with assonant final syllables, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ |\ \sigma'\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ |\ \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega\iota$, also strengthens the climactic, thematically significant $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega\iota$ at position 6. $\sigma'\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ is rhetorically effective in its juxtaposition of words having contrasting meanings (I/you) and syntactical functions (subj./obj.). Such juxtaposition is a characteristic feature of Sophoklean poetry, cf. *Introd.*, p. 35. As often, when $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ introduces an acc.-inf. construction, it means 'command'; cf. *Tr.* 137–8, Smyth §1997. $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ need not denote 'to capture' Phil., only 'to take' him by deceit; cf. English 'to take by surprise'. Cf. 107 $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega\iota\ \lambda\alpha\beta\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon$ with Kamerbeek's note.

102 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega\iota$: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is instrumental, cf. 60n. $\tau\acute{\iota}\ldots\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$: $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\tau'$ agrees with $\mu\epsilon$ understood as the subj. of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$. As often, a participle 'describing manner or means' is conjunctive, with an especially close link to the main verb: 'why must I bring him by deceit rather than persuade *and* bring him'? Cf. Moorhouse 251.

103 $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \pi\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$: $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ with subj. or fut. indic. is the strongest form of negation in Greek and is often used in emphatic negative predictions and prohibitions. Here it totally rejects the possibility, raised by Ne. in the preceding line, of persuading Phil. rather than deceiving him. Od.'s words are in striking contradiction to the terms of Helenos' prophecy, as we hear them from the False Merchant (sent by Od.) in 611–13, that the Greeks 'will *never* ($\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$) sack (Troy) unless they persuade with speech and bring this man from this island on which he now dwells'. See 610–13n. $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$: a third possibility, along with $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\acute{\omega}$. See 90n.

104 $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ldots\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ lit. 'does he have so terrible a boldness consisting of strength'? $\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ is gen. of definition.

105 $\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ (\gamma')\ \acute{\alpha}\varphi\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 'yes, arrows that can't be avoided'. Dobree's emendation nicely makes Od.'s reply more lively and idiomatic, cf. 33n. The accusatives depend on $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$, understood from 104. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 531, 635 for the arrows of Eros and Aphrodite 'that can't be avoided', Eur. *Hipp.* 1422 for those of Artemis.

106–9 Ne.'s two questions beginning with $\omicron\upsilon$ are answered by Od. in two lines beginning with $\omicron\upsilon/\omicron\upsilon\kappa$.

106 $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\iota\ldots\theta\rho\alpha\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$: cf. Pind. *Nem.* 7.50 $\theta\rho\alpha\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\delta'$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. γ' emphasizes 'that man', the one whose 'arrows can't be avoided and send forth slaughter'. 'Even to engage with' him 'is not a thing to be dared'. This is the

only example in Soph. of προσμείγνυμι used in the hostile sense found in Hdt., Thuc., and Xen. (though LSJ s.v. π.1 give the more neutral meaning ‘approach’ for προσμείζει here).

107 οὐ, μὴ . . . λαβόντα γ’ ‘no (it is not a thing to be dared), at least not unless you have taken him by deceit’. οὐ negates θρασύ, supplied from the previous line; μὴ negates λαβόντα, which agrees with τινὰ understood as the subj. of προσμείζει.

108 οὐκ . . . λέγειν ‘do you not, then, think that speaking lies (is) base and shameful?’ αἰσχρόν ‘base and shameful’ is pred. adj. in agreement with the articular inf. τὸ ψευδῆ λέγειν, which in turn is subj. of εἶναι (understood) in the indirect discourse introduced by ἡγή. Vauvilliers’ emendation – τό for τά, the reading of most MSS – is attractive, because it puts the emphasis on ‘saying things that are false’ rather than on the things themselves. Contrast fr. 352.1 καλὸν μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔστι τὰ ψευδῆ λέγειν (from *Kreousa*). **δῆτα** is often used in questions in which ‘the interrogative note is conveyed by tone of voice alone’ (GP 271).

109 οὐκ . . . φέρεi ‘no (I don’t think so), at least not if the lie brings salvation’. By ‘salvation’ (τὸ σωθῆναι), Od. means both gaining control of (Phil. and) the bow and a Greek victory at Troy. His pragmatic use of σώωζω and its cognates clashes throughout the play with the physical salvation for which Phil. struggles, in the face of his disease, on the harsh terrain of Lemnos (e.g. 297, 737); with the salvation Phil. seeks in his effort to leave the island (e.g. 311, 488, 496, 501); and with the salvation by the gods which Ne. urges on Phil. (528, 919, 1391, 1396) and which the chorus, in the end (1471), seek from the sea nymphs. This competition, as it were, to control the meaning of a word is an important feature of Sophoklean tragedy. Cf. the struggle between Kreon and Antigone over the meaning of φίλος.

110 πῶς . . . λακεῖν ‘with what sort of face, then, will anyone dare (i.e. “bring himself”) to utter this out loud?’ Ne.’s question expresses both shock and moral indignation, but οὖν, which is often used as a connective in questions admitting the force of something that has just been said or done (GP 425–6), implies that he accepts Od.’s distasteful advice. For the combination of ‘face’ and ‘daring’, see OT 533 τόλμης πρόσωπον. Cf. Aj. 462 ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανείς . . . ; Eur. *Hipp.* 415–16 αἶ πῶς ποτ’ . . . | βλέπουσιν εἰς πρόσωπα τῶν ξυνευνετῶν; L1 455 πῶς δέξομαί νιν; ποῖον ὄμμα συμβαλῶ; Shame too is often said to live or show itself in the eyes, e.g. Eur. *Her.* 1199, *Or.* 460–1, L1 378–9, 994. For πῶς οὖν, cf. OT 124; for πῶς βλέπων, OT 1371 ὄμμασιν ποίοις βλέπων, Aj. 1290 ποῖ βλέπων with Stanford’s note. λακεῖν, from λάσκω, is much more forceful than λαλεῖν, a word more common in later Greek (e.g. in the New Testament), which replaced λακεῖν in most MSS. λάσκω can denote a scream or shout (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 596, *Cho.* 35, Eur. *El.* 1214) and is sometimes used of oracular or prophetic responses (e.g. *Ant.* 1094, *Tr.* 824, Aesch. *Ag.* 1426). Perhaps Ne. is responding in kind to Od.’s slightly oracular tone in 109. **βλέπων τις** Ne.’s use of the

indefinite pron. perhaps reflects a desire to distance himself from the shame that might be seen in his own eyes.

111 **ὅταν τι δρᾷς:** Od. pointedly uses the second person in response to Ne.'s *τις*, in order to bring home to Ne. in personal terms what is expected of him. In Eur. fr. 794 (from *Philoktetes*), a Trojan envoy (perhaps Paris), trying to persuade Phil. to help the Trojans against the Greeks, tells him, ὁρᾷτε ὡς κἂν θεοῖσι κερδαίνειν καλόν' | ... τί δῆτα καὶ σὲ κωλύει (λαβεῖν) | κέρδος, παρόν γε κάξομοιοῦσθαι θεοῖς; ('you see that also among the gods to gain profit is a fine thing... what, then, prevents you too from taking profit, when it is quite possible for you to resemble the gods?') If an Athenian audience could have been expected to know that a Trojan enemy, in a formal debate with Odysseus in Eur.'s *Philoktetes* (produced twenty-two years earlier), had based part of his argument on a privileging of *kerdos* while trying to harm the Greeks, Od.'s comment to Ne. in 111 might seem striking precisely because it constituted an opportunistic appropriation, for his own strategic purposes, of the same motive that 'Odysseus' opposed in Eur.'s play in the name of patriotism. See Introd., p. 6. (For a possible pun on the name of Phil. in Eur.'s fragment, see 671–3n.) *εἰς κέρδος* 'for the purpose of gain', cf. 83n. **ὀκνεῖν:** responding to 93 ὀκνῶ.

112 **κέρδος... μολεῖν:** Ne. does not reject Od.'s ethically provocative *κέρδος*-standard. Cf. Orestes in *El.* 61 δοκῶ μὲν, οὐδὲν ῥῆμα σὺν κέρδει κακόν. Od. and Orestes resemble one another in their opportunistic, pragmatic, self-serving sophistry. Cf. fr. 833 (from an unknown play) τὸ κέρδος ἡδύ, κἂν ἀπὸ ψευδῶν ἦη.

113 **αἰρεῖ... μόνᾳ:** αἰρεῖ is an 'oracular present', which authoritatively regards a future event as present (Smyth §1882, Woodhouse 1912: 188), cf. 69, 117, 724 with n., Aesch. *Ag.* 126. Od. uses this 'oracular' form to persuade Ne. that if he will cooperate in the plot against Phil., he certainly will be able to sack Troy, and that Phil.'s bow is necessary for this outcome (cf. 115). Though 113–15 might seem to imply some special knowledge on Od.'s part, he does not mention Helenos' prophecy. Cf. 603–21n. *μόνᾳ* is emphatic because of its separation from ταῦτα and its position at the end of the line, cf. 61n. At 68 and 115, Od. speaks only of the bow, not of Phil.

114 **οὐκ... ἐγώ** 'then I am not the one who will sack (Troy), as you said'? ἄρα is an interrog. particle, 'marking the realization of the truth, or drawing a conclusion' and 'equivalent in sense to ἄρα' (*GP* 44–5), cf. 106. ἄρα need not imply either a positive or a negative reply, but as Denniston observes, 'the mere putting of a proposition in an interrogative form implies, in certain contexts, a doubt of its truth, and ἄρα... often has a skeptical tone' (*GP* 46). Here ἄρα comes second in the sentence, as is usual when it marks a realization of the truth. When it simply indicates a question, it normally comes first (*GP* 48). ὁ πέρσων is predicate nominative, agreeing with ἐγώ, which gains emphasis by its position at the end of the line and of the sentence.

115 οὐτ' ἄν... οὐτ'... σοῦ: *sc.* πέρσειας... πέρσειε... Cf. *Tr.* 462, *El.* 365 for ἄν with an omitted verb in the optative that must be supplied from the context. Od.'s artful *chiasmus*, σὺ κείνων... ἐκείνα σοῦ, within parallel οὐτε clauses, conspicuously makes no mention of Phil. Cf. 70, 113.

116 θηρατέ' οὖν... ἔχει: Ne. gives way in a line that is especially striking because it includes the only surviving example in any Greek author of γίγνομαι rather than εἶμι as the copula with a verbal adj. in -τέος, -τέα, -τέον, as well as the only example in Soph. of the verbal adj. with an optative form of the copula. This optative, in the apodosis of a mixed condition, shows Ne. drawn against his will to yield to Od.'s seduction. He clings to the tentative form of a future-less-vivid apodosis, θηρατέ' οὖν γίγνοιτ' ἄν, as if he were reluctant to face squarely the consequences of what he admits in the protasis – εἴπερ ὧδ' ἔχει – is the reality of the situation that Od. has just made plain to him. θηρατέ' <ἄν> γίγνοιτ' ἄν would perhaps reinforce Ne.'s 'hesitation and doubtfulness' (Campbell), but θηρατέ' οὖν suggests that Ne. is making an inference from what Od. has told him and for that reason seems the better emendation of the unmetrical θηρατέα found in the MSS. The force of the verbal adj. is heightened by its unusual position at the beginning of the line. None of the other thirty-three verbal adjs. in Soph.'s trimeters occurs in this position, and only four come before the caesura (*Aj.* 853, 1250, *Ant.* 677, *Tr.* 1204); cf. Schein 1998: 302, 306–7.

117–119 Od.'s δῦο in 117 and Ne.'s ποίω (dual) in the following line suggest that to be called σοφός and to be called ἀγαθός are natural equivalents. This viewpoint is in character for Od., and expressing it is a strategic move intended to convince Ne. to lie to Phil. Ne. agrees, but in the course of the play he comes to realize that to be called (and to *be*) σοφός is not the same as to be called (and to *be*) ἀγαθός, that in fact the two are incompatible: the former associates him with Od., the latter with Phil. At 1244 he actually mocks Od. as one who is 'σοφός by nature but who speaks out nothing σοφόν', and two lines later he claims that the δίκαια he himself expresses are more powerful than Od.'s σοφά. See 1244n., 1246n., von Scheliha 1970: 80, Hahnemann 2011. Cf. 25n.

117 ὥς... δωρήματα 'yes, know that [or: 'yes, for'] if you do this, you win for yourself two prizes'. For γε 'yes', see 33n., 105; for causal ὥς before an apparently independent clause, cf. 812, *Aj.* 39, Smyth §§3001, 2244, *GMT* §719; for a conditional hypothesis followed by the pres. with fut. meaning ('oracular present'), cf. 69, 113 with n., *OT* 1159 πολλῶι γε μάλλον, ἢ φράσω, διόλλυμαι. For the general sense of the apodosis, cf. *El.* 1088 δῦο φέρειν <ἐν> ἐνὶ λόγῳ. φέρημι: for the mid., cf. *OT* 500 πλέον... φέρεται.

118 ποίω... τὸ δρᾶν 'two things of what kind? When I have learned, I would not shrink from acting' (or perhaps, 'from the action', cf. the articular inf. in 620, 1241, *El.* 466–7 τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον... | ... ἐπιστεύδει τὸ δρᾶν). For the sense, cf. *OT* 571 ποῖον τόδ'; εἰ γὰρ οἶδά γ', οὐκ ἄρνήσομαι. On the articular inf. in the accusative, see Smyth §2034, K–G II.37–45.

119 σοφός τ' . . . ἄμα: cf. 85, *El.* 1089 σοφά τ' ἄριστα τε παῖς κεκλήσθαι. κεκλήι(ο) is a rare perf. opt. pass. form of καλέω (cf. *Ar. Lys.* 253 κεκλήμεθα, Smyth §711c.), a potential opt. with virtually fut. meaning. (For the perf. indic. used to denote the certainty of a future action, cf. *Eur.* 75, *Li* 915–16 ἦν δὲ τολμήσης σύ μου | χεῖρ' ὑπερτεῖναι, σεσώμεθ', *GMT* §51, K–G 1.150.) Σ on 119 suggests that σοφός refers to the theft of the bow and ἀγαθός to the sack of the city. σοφός resonates with *Od.*'s sophistic diction elsewhere in the Prologue (see 14n.), and σοφός τ' . . . κάγαθός is a characteristically Odyssean twist on καλός τε κάγαθός, the common Attic idiom expressing aristocratic excellence.

120 ἴτω . . . ἄφεις: Ne. finally surrenders. ἴτω 'let it go' frequently indicates a decisive commitment to a particular course of action, whatever the consequences, usually after some hesitation and in the face of danger or something evil; cf. *OT* 669, *Ant.* 1328, 1331, *Eur. Med.* 819. **πάσαν . . . ἄφεις:** despite being overcome by the desire for glory, Ne. retains some scruples of shame, which he must set aside. For this use of ἀφίημι, cf. *OT* 599, 860, *OC* 914.

121 ἦ . . . παρήνεσα: *Od.* asks his only question in this stichomythia. For connective οὖν coming third in the sentence, cf. *Tr.* 1247 (also a question), *OT* 141. Here οὖν is especially forceful because of its placement at position 6, following the caesura, although rhetorically it goes with ἦ μνημονεύεις in the first colon of the line. Cf. 15n.

122 συνήνεσα 'I agreed', 'I consented' is emphatic, because its final three syllables rhyme with those of the metrically identical παρήνεσα at the end of the previous line. Cf. *Aj.* 62–6, *Tr.* 1265–6, *Eur. Med.* 408–9. Stichomythia, like a formal *rhēsis*, frequently begins or ends with some stylistic flourish.

123–34 In the final lines of the Prologue, *Od.* sets the intrigue in motion with specific instructions to Ne. He anticipates the need to send back the lookout, disguised as a merchant ship's captain, with subtle and expedient advice, thus foreshadowing the scene with the FM in 542–627. *Od.* ends by anachronistically invoking his Homeric patron deity, Athena, by titles under which she was worshipped in civic cults of late fifth-century Athens. For *Soph.*'s original audience, this would certainly have helped to associate *Od.*'s style and ethical standards with those of contemporary Athenian political leaders. Cf. 15n. on ὑπηρετεῖν, *Intro.*, pp. 11–12.

123–4 σὺ μὲν . . . ἅπειμι: an artful double antithesis, σὺ μὲν μένων . . . ἐνθάδ' . . . ἐγὼ δ' ἅπειμι. **νυν:** the enclitic seems more appropriate than the accented form of the word found in most MSS, since there appears to be no temporal emphasis on 'now'. Enclitic νυν is rarely temporal and frequently inferential, as English 'now' can be used for 'then' or 'therefore' (Smyth §2926). Enclitic νυν is particularly common after imperatives, prohibitions, and hortatory subjunctives. Cf. 468, 576, 1177, 1196, 1403, 1449, 1452. **κεῖνον:** i.e. *Phil.*, cf. 37, 106, 40 ἀνὴρ, 90 τὸν ἄνδρ'.

124 κατοπτευθῶ: cf. *Aj.* 829 πρὸς ἐχθρῶν του κατοπτευθείς.

125 τὸν σκοπόν ‘the lookout’, whom Ne. had sent, at Od.’s request, to watch for Phil.’s approach (45–8). πρὸς ναῦν: it is unclear whether the ship is one in which Od. has sailed to Lemnos together with Ne., or whether each had come separately on his own ship. Soph. was not concerned to clarify the situation (cf. Avery 2002).

126–7 ἐάν μοι... κατασχολάζειν ‘if you seem to lag behind (i.e. ‘linger beyond’) the due time’ (Jebb). κατασχολάζειν governs the gen., perhaps on the model of verbs of separation (Moorhouse 67, Smyth §1392), perhaps on that of (καθ)υστερεῖν, in which κατα- expresses regret for the delay (Jebb). In either case, τι is internal acc., not dir. obj.

128 τοῦτον... ἄνδρα: cf. 45 τὸν... παρόντα. ναυκλήρου τρόποις ‘in (or ‘after’) the fashion of a merchant ship’s captain’. For plur. τρόποι ‘fashion’, ‘manner’, see *OC* 468, Aesch. *Ag.* 918, *Cho.* 479, LSJ *s.v.* τρόπος π.1. A merchant ship’s captain was an unheroic figure, sometimes scorned in Greek literature because of his concern for trade and profit. Cf. *Od.* 8.161–4, Rose 1992: 317.

129 μορφήν... προσῆι: Od. is again associated with deceit and the manipulation of appearances, cf. 82–5. In Eur.’s *Philoctetes*, Od. was disguised by Athena, so that Phil. could not recognize him, the very reason Od. gives here for disguising the lookout – ὥς ἂν ἀγνοῖα προσῆι. Budelmann 2000: 54 observes that ἀγνοῖα can signify both the ‘unrecognizability’ of the lookout and ‘ignorance’ on the part of Phil., as well as a general ‘situation of ignorance and lack of recognition’ in which the play’s spectators are uncertain of what the word denotes, especially given Od.’s allusion to, but departure from, earlier versions of the myth with which they might have been familiar. For ἀγνοῖα associated with deceit, cf. *Tr.* 350, 419. One might have expected the word to be accented *ἀγνοῖα, but words ending in -οῖα and -εῖα originally had a long final α, which is preserved in a few places in Attic drama, e.g. *Tr.* 350 ἀγνοῖα, Aesch. *Sept.* 402 ἀνοῖα, 685 εὐκλείαν, Ar. *Av.* 604 ὑγίεια; cf. K–B 1.388. ὥς ἂν is more frequent in Homer than simple ὥς in purpose clauses. ὥς ἂν and ὅπως ἂν, though *not* ἵνα ἂν, occur in Attic drama, but less frequently than simple ὥς and mainly in clauses indicating expectation or future possibility, e.g. 826, *Aj.* 655–6 ὥς ἂν... | μῆνιν βαρεῖαν ἐξαλύξωμαι θεᾶς, *OC* 575 ὅπως ἂν ἐκμάθω. Cf. Smyth §2201, *GMT* §§325–6 with Appendix III, Bers 1984: 123.

130–1 οὗ... λόγων ‘from whom, my child, as he speaks out craftily, receive what is advantageous in his words spoken from time to time’. οὗ... αὐδωμένου is felt first as gen. absol., then as gen. of origin dependent on δέχου. δῆτα following the rel. pron. is emphatic, a rare use of that particle: cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 829 οἱ δῆτ’... , *Eum.* 399 ἦν δῆτ’... , *GP* 277. With τέκνον, Od. again tries to associate Ne. with himself and his planned deception of Phil., cf. 79n. ποικίλως ‘craftily’, the only use of this word in Soph. Originally ποικίλος meant ‘of all colours’, ‘variegated’. The lyric poets sometimes combine ποικίλος or a cognate with language denoting or connoting treachery, deception, lies, and entrapment through art and

artifice, e.g. Pind. 1.29 δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι. 'In tragedy . . . *poikilos* always carries the connotation of visibly suspect finery, whether of dress, attitude, or speaking style. It is the versatile, deceitful, disguise-loving characters who make use of such intricate self-performances. These characters are the opposite of the intractable, virtuous heroic types, and their complex and changeable attitudes intimate their dangerous and flexible, persuasive, even demagogic talents' (Worman 2002: 31). In both epic and tragedy, *poikilos* and its cognates are frequently associated with Od., who is ποικιλομήτης (e.g. *Il.* 11.482, *Od.* 3.163, 7.168, 13.293) and ὁ ποικιλόφρων | κόπις ἡδυλόγος δημοχαραστής (*Eur. Hec.* 131–2; cf. *IA* 526 ποικίλος ἀεὶ πέφυκε τοῦ τ' ὄχλου μέτα. In 343 νηὶ ποικιλοστόλῳ, the adj. is not merely ornamental but suggests Od.'s planned deception of both Ne. and Phil. Cf. *OT* 130 ποικιλωιδὸς Σφίγξ, *Tr.* 412 τί ποτε ποικίλας ἔχεις, *OC* 762 μηχανήμα ποικίλον, fr. 592.5 (from *Tereus*) ποικιλομήτιδες ἔσται. τὰ συμφέροντα: things that are 'expedient', 'advantageous', 'in the interest of' – a sophistic term. Cf. Thrasymachos' definition of justice at Plato, *Rep.* 338c1–2 as τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος συμφέρον. τῶν ἀεὶ λόγων 'the words spoken from time to time', partitive gen. dependent on τὰ συμφέροντα, cf. 24n., 86. For the adv. in the attributive position, cf. *El.* 1134 τῇ τὸτ' ἡμέραι, Smyth §1096, *SCG* II.201–2.

132 σοὶ παρὲς τάδε: cf. *TrGF* fr. adesp. 353.2 (Ζεὺς) τὰ μικρὰ δ' ἄλλοις δαίμοσιν παρὲς ἔα.

133 Ἑρμῆς . . . μ' ἀεὶ 'May Hermes the escort be a guide who is deceitful for (the advantage of) the two of us'. Cf. *El.* 1395–7 ὁ Μαιῶς δὲ παῖς | Ἑρμῆς σφ' ἄγει δόλον σκότῳ | κρύψας, [*Eur.*] *Rhes.* 216–17 ἀλλ' εὖ σ' ὁ Μαιῶς παῖς ἐκέισε καὶ πάλιν | πέμπειν Ἑρμῆς, ὅς γε φηλητῶν ἄναξ. There is a special relationship between Hermes and Od. in poetic tradition. Hermes is the patron god of Od.'s maternal grandfather, Autolykos, 'who surpassed all men in thievery and swearing a (false) oath' (*Od.* 19.395–7), or in some accounts he is Autolykos' father (cf. Hes. fr. 64.18M–W, Eustathios 804, 23–6 on *Il.* 10.267, Pherekydes, *EGM* fr. 120 = Σ on *Od.* 19.432). At *Od.* 10.302–6 Hermes gives Od. a sprig of *moly*, a herb whose charm can ward off Circe's magic; she later tells Od. that Hermes had predicted that he would come to her island on his way home from Troy (10.330–2). Hermes and Od. are sometimes described in similar language, e.g. by αἰμύλος and its cognates. For Hermes, cf. *HH Hermes* 13 παῖδα πολύτροπον αἰμυλομήτην, 317–18 ὁ τέχνησιν τε καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν | ἤθελεν ἐξαπατᾶν Κυλλήνιος Ἀργυρότονον. For Od., cf. *Aj.* 388 τὸν αἰμυλώτατον, Pind. *Nem.* 8.33 αἰμύλων μύθων ὁμόφοιτος, δολοφραδῆς, [*Eur.*] *Rhes.* 709 κλωπὸς . . . φωτὸς αἰμύλον δόρυ. Od., of course, is πολύτροπον in *Od.* 1.1 etc. νῶιν is dat. dual of the first person pronoun. With this dual, Od. seems to place Ne. on an equal footing with himself in their plot against Phil. (cf. 25n.), but in 134 σώιζει μ' he refers only to himself.

134 Νίκη τ' . . . Πολιάς: Od.'s invocation of Athena would have reminded an Athenian audience of the civic cults of Ἀθηνᾶ Νίκη and Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς, which

were housed, respectively, in the temple of Athena Nike and in the Erechtheum on the Athenian acropolis. Cf. *Introd.*, 11.

ENTRY SONG (*PARODOS*), 135–218

The entry song consists of an exchange (*amoibaion*) between the Chorus, singing three strophes and antistrophes (135–43/150–8, 169–90, 201–18), and Ne., chanting three sequences of anapaests (144–9, 159–68, 191–200). Ne. sings a few lyric syllables in the first lines of strophe and antistrophe γ, and the Chorus Leader chants one anapaestic line (161). The *παρόδοι* of *El.* and *OC* are also *amoibaia*, but in *El.* the exchange between the Chorus and Elektra is entirely lyric (three pairs of strophes and antistrophes, followed by an epode), with no anapaests. On the other hand, in the *parodos* of *OC*, more of the anapaests are chanted by Oidipous and Antigone than by the Chorus Leader; there are three lines of sung anapaests at the end of the first strophe and antistrophe, and Oidipous sings substantial parts of the second strophe, antistrophe, and epode.

The Chorus, fifteen soldier-sailors older than (141, 210) and loyal to (150–1) Ne., enter singing and dancing from the audience's left, along the same *eisodos* by which Od. and Ne. entered at the beginning of the play and by which the lookout and Od. exited. From their first words, the Chorus are actively involved in the intrigue against Phil.; their language is thematically continuous with that of the Prologue. Now, however, the young Ne., who had been instructed by the older Od. in how to serve him (15–25, 50–3), is the master (135 δέσποτ') to whom the older Chorus look for guidance. Earlier the knowledgeable Od. had emphasized to the reluctant Ne. the need for 'skilful contrivance' (80 τεχνᾶσθαι, cf. 88 ἐκ τέχνης); now the Chorus ground their loyalty and obedience to Ne. in his 'skill surpassing other skill and his intelligence' (138–9 τέχνα γὰρ τέχνας ἑτέρας | . . . καὶ γνῶμα).

In strophe α the Chorus ask Ne., whose royal authority and abilities stem from Zeus, what they should conceal and what they should say to a man who is bound to be suspicious. Ne. responds, in the first anapaestic sequence, that they may inspect Phil.'s dwelling until his return, after which they should watch for Ne.'s signals and try to 'provide for the present need' (149). They assure him, in antistrophe α, that they have long been concerned with what is opportune for him, and ask in what sort of dwelling Phil. lives and where he is now. They echo Od. in their emphasis on what is opportune and their fear that Phil. may fall upon them unexpectedly (12, 131 ~ 151, 155; 46 ~ 156).

In the second anapaestic sequence, Ne. points out Phil.'s 'dwelling with doorways at both ends' (159–60) and suggests that he has gone in search of food and must be somewhere nearby (cf. Od. in 41–3): 'the story is (165 λόγος ἐστὶ) that this is how he lives, painfully hunting wild beasts for food, alone, with no healer of his troubles drawing near him' (164–8). Ne.'s emotionally neutral comment prompts a surge of sympathy from the Chorus in strophe and antistrophe β, mixed with

wonder at Phil.'s ability to survive in such painful isolation. Ne., in turn, assures the Chorus, in the third sequence of anapaests, that Phil.'s sufferings spring from 'the concern of some one of the gods' that he not aim his invincible weapons against Troy until the fated time 'at which it is said that the city must fall to them' (196–200), i.e. until now, when Ne. himself can share in the glory (cf. 113–15). Here Ne. indulges in self-serving, wishful thinking rather than well-considered theodicy; the Chorus do not respond, but instead, with a notable shift in metre and style, interrupt Ne. when they hear Phil. approaching and, through strophe and antistrophe γ, become increasingly fearful as the sound of his painful cries comes ever closer.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

	υ – υ – υ – υ – υ – υ – υ – υ ^b	
135	τί χρή, τί χρή με, δέσποτ', ἐν ξέναι ξένον	iamb trim (lyr)
150	μέλον πάλαι μέλημά μοι λέγεις, ἄναξ,	
	υ – – υ υ – υ – υ – υ – – ^c	
136	στέγειν, ἢ τί λέγειν πρὸς ἄνδρ' ὑπόπταν;	phal
151	φρουρεῖν ὄμ' ἐπὶ σῶι μάλιστα καιρῶι·	
	– υ –	
137	φράζε μοι.	cr
152	νῦν δέ μοι	
	υ – – – – υ υ – υ ^b	
138	τέχνα γὰρ τέχνας ἐτέρας	chor dim B
153	λέγ' αὐλὰς ποίας ἔνεδρος	
	– – – – – υ υ – υ – – ^{b,c}	
139	προὔχει καὶ γνώμα παρ' ὅτῳ τὸ θεῖον	2 anc + hipp
154	ναίει καὶ χῶρον τίν' ἔχει. τὸ γὰρ μοι	
	υ – – υ υ – υ – ^b	
140	Διὸς σκῆπτρον ἀνάσσεται.	glyc
155	μαθεῖν οὐκ ἀποκαίριον,	
	≡ – – – υ υ – υ – ^b	
141	σέ δ', ὦ τέκνον, τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν	anc + glyc
156	μὴ προσπείσω με λάθῃ ποθέν·	
	– υ υ – υ υ – υ – υ υ – υ	
142	πᾶν κράτος ὠγύγιον· τό μοι ἔννεπε	dact tetram
157	τίς τόπος, ἢ τίς ἔδρα; τίν' ἔχει στίβον,	
	υ – υ – υ – – ^b	
143	τί σοι χρεῶν ὑπουργεῖν.	iamb dim catalectic
158	ἔναυλον ἢ θυραῖον;	

The metre is aeolo-choriambic, like that of strophe and antistrophe γ, the stasimon at 676–729, and much of the *kommos* at 1081–1217. The main cola here include the glyconic (οο—υ—υ—), the so-called ‘choriambic dimeter B’ (—υ—υ—υ—), the hipponactean (οο—υ—υ—), and the iambic dimeter catalectic (υ—υ—υ—), along with various forms of ‘internal’ or ‘external’ ‘expansion’ (Introduct., p. 21). Every line is an independent metrical period, marked by *brevis in longo* or a standard *clausula*, except for 137/152 and 142/157. The opening iambic trimeter (135) modulates from the spoken verse of dialogue to sung verse; the corresponding verse in antistrophe α (150) is perhaps more fully lyric, because it lacks the normal caesura of spoken trimeters at position 5 or 7, since μέλημά μοι⁸ functions metrically as a single word. The cretic in 137/152 might be considered an independent, acephalic iambic metron or an iambic ‘expansion’ before the choriambic dimeter in 138/153. The dactylic tetrameter in the final period is followed, as often in Soph., by a colon beginning with a light syllable, which presumably involves a change of rhythm or ‘step’ in the choral dance, cf. *OT* 171–2, *El.* 125–6/141–2, 170–1/190–1. The ‘epic correption’ of μοι in 142 τό μοι ἔννεπε is one of several epic features in the style and diction of strophe α, e.g. 139–40 τὸ θεῖον . . . ἀνάσσειται, 142 ὠγύγιον.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe β

169	οἰκτίρω νιν ἔγωγ’, ὅπως	glyc
180	οὗτος πρωτογόνων ἴσως	
170	μή του κηδομένου βροτῶν	glyc
181	οἰκῶν οὐδενὸς ὕστερος,	
171	μηδὲ σύντροφον ὄμ’ ἔχων,	glyc
182	πάντων ἄμμορος ἐν βίῳ	
172	δύστανος, μόνος αἰεί,	pher
183	κεῖται μῦθος ἀπ’ ἄλλων	
173	νοσεῖ μὲν νόσον ἀγρίαν,	glyc
184	στικτῶν ἢ λασίων μετὰ	
174	ἀλύει δ’ ἐπὶ παντί τω	glyc
185	θηρῶν, ἐν τ’ ὀδύναις ὁμοῦ	

175–6	χρείας ἰσταμένῳ. πῶς ποτε, πῶς δύσμορος ἀντέχει;	greater
186–7	λιμῶι τ' οἰκτρὸς ἀνέκκεστ' ἀμερίμνητά τ' ἔχων βάρη.	Asclep
177	ᾧ παλάμαι θνητῶν,	dodrans A
188	ἃ δ' ἄθυρόστομος	
178	ᾧ δύστανά γένη βροτῶν	glyc
189	Ἀχῶ τηλεφανῆς πικραῖς	
179	οἷς μὴ μέτριος αἰών.	pher
190	οἰμωγαῖς ὑπακούει.	

The metre of strophe and antistrophe β is straightforward aeolic, without the iambic cola found in strophe and antistrophe α. The most common element is the glyconic (00–υ–υ–υ–), with a clausular pherecratean (00–υ–υ–) at the end of the first period (172/183) and the end of the stanza (179/190). (This is the only instance in Soph.'s surviving plays of an identical *clausula* occurring at period end both within and at the close of a stanza.) When the Chorus begin to sing about Phil.'s disease, the metre shifts slightly to a previously unexampled light syllable as the first element of the colon (173 νοσεῖ), and the pathos is heightened by the inner expansion of the glyconic into a greater Asclepiadean through the placement of two additional choriambes after the first choriamb and before the characteristic glyconic ending (00–υ–υ–υ–υ–υ–υ–υ–). In both stanzas this greater Asclepiadean, coming at period end (174–6/185–7), is rhetorically and emotionally charged: 175–6 'How, how ever did the ill-fated man hold out?' and 186–7 'pitiable in hunger and having incurable burdens that are not cared for'. There is a freedom of responsion in 177/188, ᾧ παλάμαι θνητῶν / ἃ δ' ἄθυρόστομος: the ending of 177 is 'dragged', with a penultimate syllable that is heavy instead of light as would be expected by normal rules of contrast (cf. West 1982: 193–4), while the penultimate syllable of 188 is light, as is usual in a dodrans A colon. 173/184 and 177/188 must be considered independent, one-line periods, owing to *brevitas in longo* in 184 (μετά) and 188 ἄθυρόστομος; yet the rhetoric of 177–8 (ᾧ... | ᾧ...), the syntactical overflow of 184 στικτῶν ἢ λασίων μετά into 185 θηρῶν and of 185 ἐν τ' ὀδύναις ὁμοῦ into 186 λιμῶι τ' οἰκτρὸς..., and the enjambment in 188–9 suggest that each stanza has, in effect, three main units of 4, 3, and 3 lines, respectively. In strophe and antistrophe β, the coincidence of word-end and colon-end in every line helps to demarcate the sense units with exceptional lucidity; at the same time, the enjambments in 174–175/6, 182–186/7, and 188–90 help to create an uninterrupted flow of pity and sympathy for Phil. on the part of the Chorus.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe γ

	— υ υ υ — υ υ υ — υ — υ — ^b	
201	εὔστομ' ἔχε, παῖ. τί τόδε προῦφάνη κτύπος	iamb + lecyth
210	ἀλλ' ἔχε, τέκνον· — λέγ' ὅτι. φροντίδας νέας·	
	— — — υ υ — — υ υ — — ^c	
202–3	φωτὸς σύντροφος ὡς τειρομένου (του),	lesser Ascl cat
211–12	ὡς οὐκ ἔξεδρος, ἀλλ' ἔντοπος ἀνὴρ,	
	— — — — — υ υ — —	
204	ἦ που τᾶιδ' ἦ τᾶιδε τόπων	chor dim B
213	οὐ μολπὰν σύριγγος ἔχων,	
	— — — — υ υ — —	
205	βάλλει, βάλλει μ' ἐτύμα	aceph chor dim B
214	ὥς ποιμήν ἄγροβάτας,	
	— — — — υ υ — —	
206	φθογὰ του στίβου κατ' ἀναγ-	chor dim B
215	ἀλλ' ἦ που πταίων ὑπ' ἀναγ-	
	— υ — — υ υ — —	
207	καν ἔρποντος, οὐδέ με λά-	chor dim B
216	κας βοᾷ τηλωπὸν ἰω-	
	— — — — υ υ — —	
208	θει βαρεῖα τηλόθεν αὐ-	chor dim B
217	άν, ἦ ναὸς ἄξενον αὐ-	
	— — — — υ υ — — — — ^b	
209	δὰ τρυσάνωρ· διάσημα γὰρ θρηνεῖ.	anc + glyc + 2 anc
218	γάζων ὄρμον· προβοᾷ τι γὰρ δεινόν.	

The metre of strophe and antistrophe γ is aeolo-choriambic, but with a much higher proportion of choriambic dimeters (204–8/213–17) than in strophe and antistrophe α. The stanzas begin with a line consisting of an iambic metron (x—υ—), with heavy *anceps* and resolution of the second element (—υυυ—), followed by a *lekythion* with a resolved first element (υυυ—x—υ—)—a line that with one additional *anceps* between the iambic metron and the *lekythion* would constitute an iambic trimeter. The two resolutions and the double change of speaker within the line make this an exceptionally agitated opening verse, metrically mimetic of the Chorus' heightened anxiety on hearing Phil. approach the cave. The stanza opens with two one-line periods, the second of which, a lesser Asclepiadean, ends with a one-syllable close like that of a pherecratean (202–3/211–12). The third period continues for six lines, in three of which colon boundary does not coincide with word-end, suggesting that the Chorus' anxiety cannot, as it were, be confined within normal limits, as they hear Phil.'s painful cry coming closer and closer. The metrical phrase at the end of each stanza, υυυ— — — (209 διάσημα γὰρ θρηνεῖ/218 προβοᾷ τι γὰρ δεινόν), with its 'dragged' ending, aptly concludes this remarkable period and effectively expresses the Chorus' intense emotion.

209 διάστημα γὰρ ῥοοῖ, the reading of the MSS, would be metrically possible but less effective. (For the freedom of responsion which ῥοοῖ would entail, cf. Eur. *Med.* 158–9/183 [Diggle] and ‘glyconic a’ in the list of aeolic cola at Barrett 423.)

It is difficult, as always, to say how the *parodos* as a whole would have been danced, in particular the degree to which the movements of the Chorus would have been representational or abstract. The aeolo-choriambic metre and the language of strophes and antistrophes α and γ suggest more, and more varied, movement than the ‘pure’ aeolic verse of strophe and antistrophe β. In strophe α the Chorus enter and take up position in the *orchestra*; in antistrophe α they move about as they seek specific information about Phil.’s whereabouts; in strophe and antistrophe γ they turn in different directions in their uncertainty as to Phil.’s location, and in terror at his distinctive way of walking and cry of pain. In strophe and antistrophe β, however, the Chorus’ song of sympathy and pity does not suggest significant change of position and presumably was accompanied by more restrained gestures and movement.

135–58 in both strophe and antistrophe α, rhetorical questions, conspicuous alliteration and assonance, metrical and verbal ‘rhyme’ (136 στέγειν... λέγειν, 158 ἔναυλον... θυραῖον), cognate constructions (135 ἐν ξέναι ξένον, 151 καιρῶι... 155 ἀποκαίριον), *figura etymologica* (150 μέλον... μέλημα), and figures of repetition such as anadiplosis (135 τί χρή, τί χρή) and *polyptoton* (138 τέχνα... τέχνας, 157 τίς... , τίς... τίν’) contribute to a tone of heightened emotionality.

135 ἐν ξέναι ξένον: cf. *OC* 184 ξείνος ἐπὶ ξένας and the imitations in Theodoridas, *AP* 7.722.2, and Leonidas, *AP* 7.661.3; see Bruhn §223.

136 στέγειν... λέγειν: cf. *OT* 341 σιγῇ στέγω. πρὸς... ὑπόπταν ‘to [not ‘against’] a man who will certainly be suspicious’. πρὸς with acc. is often used of words directed by one person to another with no suggestion of hostility (e.g. 579, 581). ὑπόπτῃς, which does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, suggests a man whose experience has made him habitually suspicious.

137 φράζε μοι: the chorus call on Ne. for instruction, as Ne. had earlier called on Od. (49, cf. 25).

138–40 τέχνα... ἀνάσσεται ‘for the skill surpasses other skill and the thought (other thought) of that man by whom the divine sceptre given by Zeus is royally swayed’. γνώμα is emphatic by its position after the verb. This tells against the MS variant γνώμας, which would imply that the Chorus do not consider γνώμα a wholly separate royal quality. παρ’ ὅτῳ = παρ’ ἐκείνῳ παρ’ ὅτῳ. τὸ θεῖον... ἀνάσσεται: Διός is gen. of origin. For the conception, cf. *Il.* 9.37–8 Κρόνου πάϊς... | σκήπτρῳ μὲν τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι περὶ πάντων, 9.98–9 λαῶν ἔσσι ἄναξ καὶ τοι Ζεὺς ἐγγυάλιξε | σκήπτρόν τ’ ἡδὲ θέμιστας. Cf. 6n. The passive of ἀνάσσω occurs elsewhere only at *Od.* 4.177; it implies ἀνάσσειν σκήπτρον ‘to rule with the sceptre’, where σκήπτρον would be, virtually, an adverbial cognate acc. Cf. *OC* 449 σκήπτρα κραίνειν, Nonnos 41.389 σκήπτρον ἡνιοχέει, Seneca

Oed. 620 *qui sceptrā duro . . . imperio regit*, Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* iv.1.189 'But Mercy is above this sceptred sway'.

141 σέ is emphatic by its position at the beginning of the sentence and the line. The acc. of a person as the end of motion with ἐρχομαι is unparalleled, but this construction is found with βαίνω (Eur. *Hipp.* 1371, Ar. *Nub.* 30) and is common with ἰκνέομαι and ἰκάνω, -ομαι (Smyth §1588, Moorhouse 45).

142 κράτος ὠγύγιον: τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τιθέμενον κράτος (Σ). ὠγύγιον normally means 'primeval, primal . . . of earlier ages' (LSJ *s.v.*) and is generally used of cities, e.g. Thebes (*OC* 1769–70), Athens (Aesch. *Pers.* 975, *Eum.* 1036), Egyptian Thebes (Aesch. *Pers.* 37). Cf. Simias, *AP* 15.24.12 ὠγύγιον σκάπτρον, probably an imitation of the present passage. τὸ 'therefore', an epicism, followed by ἐννεπε introducing an indir. question with which the Chorus return to their request for Ne.'s guidance.

143–9 Ne. replies that the Chorus, for now, may view Phil.'s dwelling without fear, but when he returns they should come forward at Ne.'s signal and try to help as needed.

144–6 νῦν μὲν . . . ὁπότεν δέ: the contrast is between the Chorus' 'looking' (pres. tense) and Phil.'s arrival conceived of as instantaneous (aor. μόλη). ἴσως . . . κέτται is parenthetical, and γάρ indicates that the parenthesis offers an explanation of what is being said in the clause that it interrupts. Cf. 81–2n., *GP* 68–9.

ἔσχατιᾷς is locative dat., 'in the extreme parts' of the island, i.e. at the edge of the sea. Cf. the location of the cave of the Kyklops at *Od.* 9.182 ἐνθάδ' ἐπ' ἔσχατιῇ σπέος εἶδομεν ὄγχι θαλάσσης, and of the great trees to which Kalypso leads Od., so he can build a raft, at *Od.* 5.238 νήσον ἐπ' ἔσχατιήν. The less well-attested MS reading, ἔσχατιᾶς, is true to Homeric usage (always in the sing.), but τόπον ἔσχατιᾶς would be awkward, despite *Aj.* 437–8 τὸν αὐτὸν ἐς τόπον | Τροίης ἐπελθών. Elsewhere ἔσχατιά can denote the land near the border or boundary of a country (e.g. *Il.* 9.484, *Od.* 3.294), the 'wild countryside' most distant from an urban centre 'at the farthest limit of the ἀγρός' (Vidal-Naquet 1988: 165–6). Cf. Hdt. 3.106.1, 116.3 τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς γῆς, denoting 'the extremities of the earth' (cf. Romm 1992: 38–9).

τόπον . . . ὄντινα κέτται 'the place in which he lies', i.e. which he inhabits. Verbs of positioning can take an internal, quasi-cognate acc. of the place in which one stands, sits, or lies, e.g. *OT* 161 ἄ . . . θρόνον εὐκλέα θάσσει, Aesch. *Ag.* 183 σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων, Eur. *Supp.* 987 αἰθερίαν ἔστηκε πέτραν. κείμεαι is a traditional word for the crippled Phil. on Lemnos, cf. *Il.* 2.721 ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κέϊτο κρατέρ' ὄλγεα πάσχαων.

146 θαρσῶν: because Phil. is absent from the cave.

146–7 ὁπότεν . . . οὐκ μελάρων 'when the strange and terrible wayfarer who inhabits this dwelling comes'. οὐκ is crasis of ὁ and ἐκ. With the reading of the MSS, τῶνδ' ἐκ μελάρων, the meaning would be, 'When the strange and terrible wayfarer comes out of this dwelling', but the Chorus cannot know that Phil. will make his appearance from within the cave. (See *Introd.*, p. 13.) Phil.

is δεινός ('strange and terrifying') because of his wild and isolated existence and invincible weapon. ὁδίτης, an epic word for a 'journeyer', 'wayfarer', 'passenger', or 'passer-by' (e.g. *Il.* 16.263, *Od.* 7.204, 13.123, 23.274), is found only here in extant tragedy. Following Σ (σὺ τῶν μελάρων ἀποστὰς ὑπηρετεῖ μοι), some editors place a comma after ὁδίτης instead of μελάρων, making Ne. tell the Chorus to 'advance from this dwelling and help me', but there is no indication that they ever enter the cave.

148 πρὸς... προχωρῶν 'advancing toward my hand (i.e. 'at my signal'), from time to time'; cf. 131 τῶν αἰὲ λόγων. It is unclear whether Ne. means 'advancing' literally or figuratively, in the sense of 'proceeding', 'acting'.

149 πειρῶ... θεραπεύειν 'try to provide for the present (need)', answering 142–3 τὸ μοι ἔννεπε | τί σοι χρεὼν ὑπουργεῖν. Cf. Pl. *Gorg.* 499c5 τὸ παρὸν εὖ ποιεῖν, 'proverbial for making the best of what one has got' (Dodds 317), *El.* 1305–6 οὐ γὰρ ἂν καλῶς | ὑπηρετοῖην τῷ παρόντι δαίμονι. For θεραπεύειν, cf. *Thuc.* 3.56.3 τὸ δὲ ξυμφέρον μᾶλλον θεραπεύοντες, *Dem.* 18.307 τοὺς... καιροῦς... θεραπεύειν.

150–8 the Chorus assure Ne. that they have long been concerned to act in his interests, then renew their questions about Phil.'s dwelling and present location. As in 135–43, they sing in a linguistically and rhetorically heightened style.

150 μέλον... ἀναξ: in most MSS this line ends (unmetrically) with two additional words, τὸ σόν, which probably originated as a marginal gloss on 151 ὄμμ', misunderstood as the obj. of 151 φρουρεῖν and as referring to Ne. ('to observe your eye', i.e. to observe you). ὄμμ', however, is better understood as subj. of φρουρεῖν (cf. 151n.), and it is in character for the Chorus to refer to Ne. as ἀναξ (cf. 139–40 παρ' ὧτω... σκῆπτρον ἀνάσσεται, 135 δεσπότη'). Therefore it is best to follow Triklinios and most modern editors in accepting ἀναξ and omitting τὸ σόν. For the emphatic etymological figure μέλον... μέλημα, cf. 173 νοσεῖ... νόσον, *Tr.* 706 ἔργον... ἐξείργασμένον, *Eur. Andr.* 868 δεῖμ' ὁ δειμαίνεις.

151 φρουρεῖν... καιρῶι 'that my eye watch for what is most opportune for you', in apposition to and defining 150 μέλημα, with ὄμμ' as subj. of φρουρεῖν (see previous n.). Cf. *Tr.* 225–6 οὐδέ μ' ὀμματος | φρουρὰν παρῆλθε. This interpretation is much more likely than 'to keep a watchful eye on...', with ὄμμ' understood as a kind of cognate obj. of φρουρεῖν. (*Tr.* 914–15 κάγῳ λαθραῖον ὄμμ' ἔπεσκιασμένη | φρούρουν is sometimes cited as a parallel for the latter interpretation, but there ὄμμ' is acc. of respect with ἐπεσκιασμένη, 'shadowed as to my eye'.)

153–4 λέγ'... ἔχει: the Chorus ask Ne. two indirect questions: 'what sort of lodging' (αὐλὰς ποίας, cf. 30 καταυλισθεῖς) Phil. inhabits as a resident (ἐνεδρος, cf. 157 ἔδρα) and where he is now (καὶ χῶρον τίν' ἔχει), cf. 22–3, *OC* 37 ἔχεις... χῶρον). Ne. replies in 159–60, 162–3.

154–5 τὸ . . . ἀποκαίριον ‘for this thing is not untimely for me to learn’. τὸ is an epicizing demonstrative (= τοῦτο). ἀποκαίριον, found only here in surviving Greek literature, is pred. adj., and its understated negation by οὐκ (‘not untimely’) is stronger than simple καίριον would be.

156 μὴ προσπεσών . . . λάθῃ: cf. 46n.

157 τίς . . . τίς . . . τίν’ . . . : the repeated questions indicate the Chorus’ urgency and anxiety. Cf. 175 πῶς ποτε, πῶς δύσμορος ἀντέχει; and 688–91. τόπος often refers not merely to a ‘place’ in the sense of a ‘locality’ or ‘spot’ (as in 144), but to a ‘place occupied’ or the ‘position’ of someone or something. In the plur. (e.g. 40, 204), it can have the wider meaning ‘vicinity’, ‘area’. Cf. Chadwick 281–3.

157–8 τίν’ . . . ἐναυλον ‘where is he planting his footstep(s), within or outside (his dwelling)?’ With the emendation ἐναυλος ἢ θυράσιος, the adjs. would refer to Phil. himself, not to his ‘footstep(s)’, and στίβον would mean ‘path’, but cf. 2n.

159–68 Ne. responds to the Chorus’ questions about Phil.’s dwelling and present location and adds further information, introduced by the vague λόγος ἐστί, about his way of life.

159–60 οἶκον . . . κοίτης ‘here you see this dwelling (of his) with doorways at both ends, consisting of a rocky resting-place’. μέν with no answering δέ and deictic τόνδ’ are emphatic and call attention to the strangeness of Phil.’s ‘dwelling’; cf. 32 οἰκοποιός, 534 ἄοικον εἰσοίκησιν. πετρίνης κοίτης is gen. of definition, cf. 81–2n. κοίτη can be used not only of human dwellings but, e.g., of a birds’ nest (cf. Eur. *Ion* 155) or a spider’s lair (*Arist. HA* 623a12); cf. 19 αὐλίου with 17–19n.

162 φορβῆς χρεῖαι: cf. 43–4n.

163 στίβον ὀγμεύει lit. ‘ploughs his footstep(s)’. An ὄγμος (cognate with Lat. *agmen*) is a ploughed ‘furrow’, and ὀγμεύω denotes the ploughman’s laboured movement in a straight line. Cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 2.4.20 ὠγμευον αὐτῶι ‘they were moving (i.e. ‘marching’) slowly in a straight line before him’.

164–5 ταύτην . . . φύσιν ‘the story is that he has this kind (lit. ‘nature’) of life’, referring to the effort described in 162–3. φύσις can be used in a variety of periphrases (LSJ s.v. π.5); here it suggests that Phil.’s misfortune has become ingrained in nature and that his way of life, which really is the result of his treatment by other men, is now ‘natural’, like that of the wild beasts he hunts, rather than social and civilized – a theme developed in strophe and antistrophe β. Ne. does not say where, when, or from whom he heard this ‘story’ about Phil. At one time or another, every character in the play provides information without naming a source or otherwise indicating how he knows what he claims to know. This vagueness contributes to the play’s distinctive atmosphere of uncertainty about what is true, and raises the question whether ‘truth’ is a meaningful concept in the world of the play.

166 πτηνοῖς ἰοῖς: ἰοῖς may suggest, by a play on ἰός ‘arrow’ and ἰός ‘poison’, that Phil. uses the arrows Herakles had poisoned with the blood of the

Hydra. Cf. *Tr.* 573–4, 707, 834–7. This would give special point to 105 *λοὺς γ' ἀφύκτους καὶ προπέμποντας φόνον*. One might ask how Phil. could have survived by using poisoned arrows for eatable prey, but perhaps the association between the two senses of *ίός* is poetically relevant despite this 'realistic' consideration.

στυγερόν στυγερώς 'wretchedly wretched'. This emendation of *στυγερόν στυγερώς* ('hatefully hateful'), the reading of the MSS, is based on Σ's *ἐπιπόνως* 'with painful toil' and on the notion that 'hatefully hateful' does not express such 'painful toil' in relation to *θηροβολοῦντα* 'hunting wild beasts', while *στυγερόν στυγερώς* does. In light, however, of *Tr.* 1015–16 *βίου . . . τοῦ στυγεροῦ*, paraphrased by Σ as *τοῦ μοχθηροῦ βίου* and referring to Herakles' 'wretched life', it remains possible that *στυγερόν στυγερώς* is correct.

168 παιῶνα: *Παιών* is the Attic-Ionic form of *Παῖάν*, the healer-god (cf. 832), and a *παιών* is a 'healer' or 'physician'. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 99 *παιών τε γενοῦ τῆσδε μερίμνης*. *ἐπινωμᾶν* 'move toward', 'approach', with subj. acc. *τιν'* . . . *παιῶνα* in indirect discourse dependent on *λόγος ἐστί*. *ἐπινωμᾶν* here and 717 *προσενώμα* are the only examples in extant Greek literature of *νωμάω* or its cognates used intransitively.

169–90 in strophe and antistrophe β, the Chorus shift to purely aeolic metre as they express pity for Phil., ask rhetorically how he can have endured his painful isolation, but make no reference to the intrigue against him.

169–75 οἰκτίρω νιν . . . ἱσταμένωι lit. 'I, for my part, pity him, how – with not any of mortals caring (for him), and not having the sight of (i.e. not being able to see) a man who shares his subsistence – wretched, always alone, he is sick with a savage sickness and wanders in his mind (i.e. 'goes mad') at every something of need as it arises'. 169 *ὅπως* looks forward to 173 *νοσεῖ* and 174 *ἀλύει*. These verbs 'explain' why the Chorus feel pity, just as 170–1 *μή του . . . ἔχων* 'explains' Phil.'s situation.

μή του . . . αἰεῖ: the gen. absol. is parallel to the separate participial phrase in agreement with the subj. of the sentence and the two appositive adjs. Cf. Thuc. 1.2.2 *τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἄδεῶς ἀλλήλοις*. *μή* is 'generic', invoking a general situation, and causal: 'because there was not any of mortals caring . . .'. For *ὄμμα* designating Phil.'s sight of a comrade, rather than 'the eye or face of someone who lives with him' (Webster), cf. Σ *μηδὲ ὁρῶν εἰς ἀνθρώπον σύνοικον*, Barrett 2007: 359–61. Triklinios' *μηδ' αὖ* may have been metrically motivated by the mistaken assumption that the second element in a glyconic must be heavy, but it nicely restores an adverb that idiomatically helps the sentence move from one explanation of Phil.'s situation to another. Triklinios' *αἰεῖ* restores both metrical respiration (with 183 *ἄλλων*) and a clausular pherecratean to end the metrical period.

μόνος recurs in choral song at 183 and 688 to describe Phil.'s isolation on Lemnos; Phil. himself uses the word at 227, 286, 470, 809, 954.

νοσεῖ . . . ἀγρίαν: for the quasi-etymological figure, cf. 150; for *ἀγρίαν*, see 9n.

ἀλύει . . . ἱσταμένωι 'he is afflicted with madness by every (item) of need, whatever (it might be), as it arises'. For the partitive gen., cf. *Aj.* 314 *ἐν τῷ (= τίνι) πράγματι*, *Ant.* 1229

ἐν τῷ (= τῖνι) συμφορᾷ. The Chorus follow their emphasis on Phil.'s physical suffering (μέν) with a description of his psychological condition (δέ) that is strengthened by the powerful verb ἀλύει 'wander mentally', 'be afflicted with madness'. Cf. 1194–5, *OT* 694–5 γὰρ ἑμὰν ἐν πόνοις | ἀλύουσας, *El.* 135 ἔατε μ' ὥδ' ἀλύειν.

177–9 ὦ... αἰῶν 'O devices of mortals (θνητῶν), O wretched races (or 'generations', cf. *OT* 1186, *LSJ* s.v. γένος III.2) of mortals (βροτῶν), for whom life is without moderation'. This is the text of the MSS, but most recent editors accept Lachmann's θεῶν for θνητῶν in 177, which regularizes the metrical responson with 188, eliminates the repetition θνητῶν/βροτῶν in consecutive lines, and introduces a familiar, 'Sophoklean' conception of the mysterious relation between divine dispensation and human suffering. Nevertheless, θνητῶν makes more sense in context. The Chorus have in mind Phil.'s relation to and isolation from other human beings, not from the gods. ὦ παλάμαι θνητῶν not only offers a general answer to the question in the preceding line, 'How, how ever does the bitter-fated man hold out?' It also suggests the 'devices' of the particular men who marooned him so cruelly. Up to this point in the play, no character has claimed that Phil.'s sufferings come from the gods; when Ne. does so in 191–200, he is responding precisely to the Chorus' emphasis on human responsibility. For the meaning of παλάμαι, cf. 1206n.

179 οἷς... αἰῶν 'those whose life does not have moderation', but also 'those whose life exceeds moderation'. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 125–7 'For first of all the mere name of what is moderate (μετρίων) wins first prize in the speaking of it, and (secondly) in action (moderation) is by far the best thing for mortals' (tr. Mastronarde).

180–90 the Chorus further develop the themes of Phil.'s isolation and deprivation. 'The sequence of prepositions (182 ἀμμορος, 184 μετὰ, 185 ἐν), which underlines the hero's state of abandonment and privation, suggests that the animals of the island, like his (physical) sufferings and hunger, have in a way taken the place of a neighbour by his side' (Mauduit 1995: 347). Cf. 691–9, 936–40.

180–1 πρωτογόνων... ὑστερος 'inferior to no man of noblest houses' (cf. Σ πρωτογόνων· εὐγενῶν). Cf. *Ant.* 746 ὦ μαιρὸν ἦθος καὶ γυναικὸς ὑστερον, *Pl. Tim.* 20a2–3 οὐσίαι καὶ γένει ουδενὸς ὑστερος ὦν τῶν ἐκεῖ. οὐδενός· sc. ἀνδρός.

182 πάντων... ἐν βίῳ 'destitute in his life, of all things' (Jebb), not 'of all things in life'. ἀμμορος is an epic word (e.g. *Il.* 18.489 = *Od.* 5.275) found in tragedy only here and at Eur. *Hec.* 421 πεντήκοντά γ' ἀμμοροὶ τέκνων. Cf. 176 δύσμορος.

183 κεῖται... ἄλλων: on κεῖται, see 144–6n. In Homer κεῖμαι can be used of corpses 'lying dead', e.g. *Il.* 18.20, 16.776 = *Od.* 24.40; here, as at 145, it suggests Phil.'s virtual or symbolic death on Lemnos. Cf. 145n., 359n., *Introd.*, pp. 15–16.

μοῦνος ἀπ' ἄλλων 'alone, apart from other (human beings)'. For the same pleonasm, cf. *HH Hermes* 193. For the ionicism, see *Introd.*, p. 32.

184–5 στικτῶν . . . θηρῶν supplements, by hyperbolic contrast, 183 μῦθος ἀπ’ ἄλλων. ‘Spotted’ and ‘shaggy’ vividly intensify Phil.’s dislocation from human society to wild nature.

185–7 ἐν τ’ . . . βάρη ‘pitiable at the same time in both pain and hunger, having burdens that are incurable and not cared for’. Despite the lack of strict parallelism between τ’ ὀδύναις and λιμῶι τ’, both nouns go with ἐν and specify the circumstances in which Phil. is οἰκτρός. Hermann’s βάρη. ἃ δ’ . . . corrects βαρεῖα δ’, the reading of the MSS, which is impossible metrically because the period must end after ἔχων ~ (cf. 176), and the first syllable of 188 should be heavy (cf. 177 ῶ). With Page’s ἀνήκεστ’ ἀμερίμνητά τ’, both adjectives modify βάρη, the obj. of ἔχων. ἀμερίμνητος, does not occur elsewhere, but cf. *Aj.* 1206 ἀμέριμνος ‘uncared for’. ἐν τ’ ὀδύναις: for ἐν used of circumstances, cf. 1004 ἐν χρεῖαι, *OT* 1112–13 ἐν τε γὰρ μακρῶι | γήραι.

188 ἀθυρόστομος ‘whose mouth has no door’, i.e. who has no control over what she says’. This adj. occurs only here in extant Greek literature, but cf. Simon. 541.2 ἀθυρον [σ]τόμα, Eur. *Or.* 903 ἀθυρόγλωσσος.

189 τηλεφανής ‘visible from afar’, i.e. coming from afar, only here used of a sound; cf. 216–17 τηλωπὸν ἰω- | άν, 201–2 προὔφανη κύπτος, *OT* 186 παίων . . . λάμπει. For the reverse effect, cf. *Tr.* 693–4 δέркоμαι φάτιν | ἄφραστον. The synaesthetic descriptions of Phil.’s cries call attention to their distinctive, desolated, non-communicative quality. As these cries become more insistent in the final strophe and antistrophe of the *parodos*, they heighten the Chorus’ fear and compassion. See Segal 1977a: 92–3.

189–90 πικραῖς . . . ὑπακούει ‘hears and responds to his bitter cries of sorrow’ (οἰμωγαῖς suggests the sound of the cry οἶμοι). Echo’s unselective responses can offer Phil. no meaningful companionship or consolation, though at 1458–60, when he is about to leave the island, Phil. speaks of her as a benign companion. For ὑπακούω ‘answer by voice (or act) when called’, see LSJ *s.v.* 1.2. On πικραῖς, both ‘bitter’ and ‘shrill’, see Griffith on *Ant.* 423–4.

191–200 Ne. expresses confidence that Phil.’s snakebite on Chryse and years of suffering are part of a divine arrangement to prevent him from aiming his arrows against Troy, before the time at which the city is fated to fall beneath them. Ne. does not say how he knows this and does not mention Helenos’ prophecy (cf. 604–13), which he cites at 1336–42 when trying to persuade Phil. to accompany him to Troy. 192, however, may help to suggest that Ne. is working this out on the basis of what he has been told and what he now hears from the Chorus.

192 θεῖα is pred. adj., emphatic by its position in its grammatical clause and in the line. For Ne.’s assertion that divinity is responsible for Phil.’s suffering, cf. 1326. At 1039, Phil. sees a ‘divine goad’ as having spurred the Greeks to seek his help.

194 τῆς . . . Χρύσης: gen. of origin, common with verbs of motion, cf. Smyth §1410, Moorhouse 60. Chryse is the nymph to whom the island of

Chryse (270), near Lemnos, was sacred. Cf. 270, 1327-8, fr. 384 (from *The Lemnian Women*) ὦ Λῆμνε Χρύσης τ' ἀγχιτέρμονες πάγοι. Chryse is called 'savage-minded', as if the snake that bit Phil. did so by her will or at her command. In *Il.* 2.723 the snake itself is ὀλοόφρονος, cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 511 δρακόντων δυσφρόνων.

195-6 καὶ νῦν . . . μελέτηι 'and in regard to what he now suffers apart from caregivers, there is no way (he does) not (suffer these things) by concern of someone of the gods'. & is acc. of respect (cf. Easterling on *Tr.* 137); as often, the rel. clause precedes the main clause, cf. *El.* 644-5, 1095-6, *OT* 68-9, *Tr.* 494-5 (Smyth §2541, Moorhouse 271-2, K-G II.420 Anm. 2). Porson's ἔσθ' ὡς corrects the unmetrical ἔσθ' ὅπως of the MSS; cf. *Ant.* 750 ταύτην ποτ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὡς ἔτι ζῶσαν γαμεῖς. **κηδεμόνων:** in Homer, κηδεμόνες are 'kindred mourners' bound by family ties to a dead person for whom they lament; here the word suggests that Phil. is virtually or symbolically dead on Lemnos (cf. 144n. 183 κείται, 209 θρηνηῖ). In poetry after Homer, κηδεμόνες can also be used more generally of those who protect and care for others (e.g. Theognis 645, Aesch. *Supp.* 76, Ar. *Vesp.* 242), a sense of the word also suggested in 195. **θεῶν:** pronounced as a monosyllable, with synizesis of ε and ω. 11 of Soph.'s twenty-five instances of synizesis in forms of θεός occur in *Ph.* (cf. 433, 736, 747, 779, 933, 1020, 1036, 1163, 1185, 1235, 1301).

197-8 τοῦ μὴ . . . τεῖναι . . . βέλη 'in order that this man not aim the gods' unconquerable shafts'. The gen. of the articular inf. can be used to signify purpose, after expressed or (as here) implied verbs of hindering, preventing, etc. This construction is more common in prose writers, esp. Thucyd., than in poetry (Smyth §2744.5, *GMT* 807-10, K-G II.40). For τεῖνω 'aim', cf. Soph. fr. 441a6-7 (from *Niobe*) ο[ὗ] τενεῖς ταχύν / ἰό[ν], LSJ τεῖνω 1.4; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 9.590 *intendisse sagittas*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.29.9 *sagittas tendere*. **τὰ . . . βέλη** 'the gods' unconquerable shafts', perhaps because Herakles himself is a god, but more likely because Phil.'s bow and arrows were originally a gift from Apollo to Herakles (cf. Apollod. II.4.11.9, Diod. Sic. IV.14.3). The bow and arrows of any outstanding archer can be called a gift of Apollo (e.g. *Il.* 2.827, from Apollo to Pandaros; 15.441, from Apollo to Teukros); cf. Willcock 1970: 3-4. Elsewhere ἀμάχητος means 'not having fought', 'not having been in battle'; only here does it mean 'which cannot be fought', 'unconquerable' (LSJ *s.v.*). Cf. ἀνίκητος / ἀνικατος 'unconquerable' at 78, *Ant.* 781, *OC* 1515, 1568.

199 ἐξήκοι: opt. because of secondary sequence of moods, following the past tense implied in θεῶν του μελέτηι ('by the care of (i.e. 'taken by') some god'). Schaefer's ἐξήκηι would be unusually vivid and emphatic, but, in the context of the vivid demonstratives 199 ὅδ' and 200 τῶνδε, may be right. **ὅδ':** ὅδε is relatively rare as the demonstrative correlative to a relative pronoun (here ὥι); it is more vivid and emphatic than the usual οὗτος would be (K-G 1.647). **λέγεται:** Ne. does not say by whom (cf. 165 λόγος ἐστί) and does not refer to Helenos' prophecy (cf. 191-200n).

200 **χρήναι**: through the fifth century, *δεῖ* tends to refer to or suggest some external, objective constraint or force – including causal necessity or divine inevitability – by which something is ‘necessary’. By contrast, *χρή* and related words usually refer to subjective, internally based needs, requirements, and constraints. This distinction begins to break down toward the end of the fifth century, when the process begins by which ‘*δεῖ* ultimately ousted *χρή* from the spoken language’ (Barrett 164). Here Ne.’s ‘must’ is based on his sense of his own ‘necessary’ role in the conquest of Troy. Cf. *OC* 812 *ἐνθα* *χρή* *ναίειν* *ἐμέ*. **τῶνδε**: normally *οὗτος* looks backward and *δδε* forward, so *τούτων* (referring to *βέλη*) might be expected. *δδε*, however, is often used of objects or persons ‘present to mind’, and Ne.’s (*ὑπό*) *τῶνδε* (*δομῆναι*), like 199 *δδ’*, anticipates, as it were, the destined moment of the city’s fall. **σφ’** is acc. sing. = *αὐτήν*. In tragedy *σφε* can be third-person sing. or plur., masc. or fem.

201–18 the Chorus herald the arrival of Phil., with an emphasis on the anxiety and fear caused by the (offstage) sound of his approach and, esp. in the antistrophe, with sympathy for his painful isolation. The increasingly loud, increasingly human-sounding cries of pain (202 *κτύπος*, 206 *φθογγά*, 208–9 *αὐ- | δα*, 216–17 *ῶ- | ἄν*) build to a spectacular *coup de théâtre* as Phil. appears at the mouth of his cave, facing Ne., the Chorus, and the audience.

201–2 **εὔστομ’ . . . κτύπος**: double *antilabē* (change of speaker within a line) is rare in Sophoclean lyric, occurring only here and at *OT* 654–5/683–4, *El.* 829–30/844–5, and *OC* 212, 224. (There are three changes of speaker in *OC* 539/546.) Here the double *antilabē* marks the excited anticipation of the Chorus, who, in response to Ne.’s colloquial *τί τόδε*, try to turn his attention from thoughts of the divine role in Phil.’s suffering to the sound of his drawing near. **εὔστομ’ ἔχε** ‘keep quiet’ (= *εὐφήμει*), cf. *Hdt.* 2.171.1, 2 *εὔστομα* *κείσθω*, *Ar. Nub.* 833 *εὔστόμει*, *LSJ s.v.* *εὔστομος* II.2. A neut. plur. adj. can be used as an adv., esp. with verbs of motion, e.g. *Aj.* 196–7 *ἀτάρβηθ’ | ὁρμάται*, *OT* 883 *ὑπέροπτα . . . πορεύεται*, *OC* 1695–6 *οὐ- | τοι κατάμεπτ’ ἔβητον* (all lyric passages). **παῖς**: cf. 863, 1072. For the Chorus of sailors, perhaps veterans who formerly served under Achilles, Ne. is both the *ἄναξ* (cf. 140, 150, 507, 510, 963) whom they obey and the ‘child’ (cf. 141, 210, 843, 845, 855, 863, 1072) whom they counsel. **προϋφάνη κτύπος**: for the synaesthesia, cf. 189 *Ἀχῶ τηλεφανῆς* with 189n.

202–3 **φωτὸς . . . (του)**: the Chorus describe Phil.’s cry as that which might be an ‘everyday companion living with some man oppressed (by constant pain and sorrow)’. Cf. 171 *σύντροφον* *δμῶ*, *Aj.* 639–40 *συντρόφοις | ὀργαῖς*. *σύντροφος*, which usually takes the dat., here governs the gen. *τειρομένου* <του> and is virtually a substantive. Porson’s <του> restores metrical responsion with 211–12.

204 **ταῖδ’ . . . τόπων**: *τόπων* is partitive gen., dependent on *ταῖδε*, cf. 1181 *ναὸς ἱν’*, *OT* 108 *ποῦ γῆς*; Cf. Lat. *hic, illic locorum*. On the meaning of *τόπων*, see 157n.

205-6 βάλλει, βάλλει... φθογγά: cf. *Ant.* 1187-8 καὶ με φθόγγος... βάλλει δι' ὧτων, *Il.* 10.535 ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὐατα βάλλει. The anadiplosis βάλλει, βάλλει expresses the Chorus' increasing excitement and apprehension. Contrast the quite different effect of *epanalepsis* of the same verb in 289-90 βάλλον πελείας: πρὸς δὲ τοῦθ', ὃ μοι βάλοι | ... ἄτρακτος... ἐτύμα 'real', 'actual', not imagined. In Attic Greek, ἔτυμος is usually an adj. of two endings, with fem. nom. ἔτυμος, e.g. *Eur. Hel.* 351 βάξις ἔτυμος, *Ar. Pax* 114-15 ἔτυμός γε | ... φάτις.

206-7 του στίβου... ἔρποντος lit. 'of someone creeping with painful constraint of movement', i.e. 'constrained and compelled to creep painfully', with στίβου understood as dependent on ἀνάγκαν. With the MS variant στίβον, the sense would be 'of a man creeping on his way by painful necessity', with στίβον understood as internal obj. of ἔρποντος, cf. 163 στίβον ὀγμύει, 1223 κέλευθον ἔρπει, *Ant.* 1212-13 δυστυχιστάτην | κέλευθον ἔρπω. Despite these parallels, στίβου is the correct reading and exemplifies the consistent use of the word in this play to denote Phil.'s 'way of walking' rather than the 'path' he takes (cf. 215-16 πταίων ὑπ' ἀνάγκ- / κας..., 2n.). With either reading, 206 του 'someone' is preferable to τοῦ after 203 <του>.

207-9 οὐδέ με λάθει... αὐδά: the neg. formulation reinforces 205-6 βάλλει, βάλλει... Cf. *El.* 222 ἔξοιδ', οὐ λάθει μ' ὀργά. βαρεῖα 'painful and deeply sorrowful'. For the connotations of βαρύς used of groans or cries, see Chadwick 69-70. αὐδά τρυσάνωρ 'a sound like that of a man who is worn out'. τρύω and τείρω (cf. 203 τειρομένον <του>) are cognate (Chantraine, *DELG*, s.vv.). The formation of τρυσάνωρ implies an active sense, 'man-wearying' (cf. φθισήνωρ 'man-destroying'), but sometimes in Soph. lyric, the meaning of an adj. is conveyed by its association with other words rather than by the adj.'s historical formation. Cf. 693 κακογείτονα 'a neighbour to his evils', *Ant.* 1022 ἀνδροφθόρου... αἵματος 'the blood of a man who has perished', *Tr.* 840 φόνια δολιόμυθα κέντρ(α) 'the murderous goads inflicted through guileful speech'. Cf. Campbell, *Essay* 39, §23.ζ. διάσημα γὰρ θρηνεῖ 'for he laments with a dirge most clearly' explains 207-8 οὐδέ με λάθει... The emendation θρηνεῖ for θροεῖ, the reading of the MSS, and the transposition of 218 γάρ τι into τι γάρ, together restore exact metrical responsion between 209 and 218. Cf. 218n. and *Aj.* 582, where θροεῖν is a MS variant for θρηνεῖν. Here θρηνεῖ is appropriate thematically as well as metrically, since a dirge is, by definition, a lament for the dead, and Phil. is elsewhere spoken of as symbolically 'dead' (cf. 144-6n., 182n.).

210 ἄλλ' ἔχει: as in 201, the double *antilabē* is a sign of the Chorus' heightened fear and anxiety. In response to Ne.'s urgent λέγ' ὅτι, the Chorus' φροντίδας νέας in effect tell him once and for all to focus on Phil.'s imminent presence.

212 οὐκ... ἐντοπος 'not away from home but in (this) place', cf. 153 ἐνεδρος, 157 ἔδρα, 204 τόπων. Hearing Phil.'s sound, the Chorus understand that he is now within the cave, having entered through the mouth that is invisible to

themselves and the audience (cf. 16 δίστομος πέτρα, 159 οἶκον... ἀμφίθυρον, *Introd.*, p. 13).

213–14 οὐ μολπὰν... ἀγροβάτας: the Chorus contrast the sound of Phil.'s painful lament to the melody played on the panpipes (σύριγξ) by a 'shepherd who roams the wilds' – an anticipation of the role of panpipes in 'idyllic' representations of the countryside. The shepherd too is an isolated individual, but one whose isolation, unlike that of Phil., is normal.

215–16 πταίων ὑπ' ἀνάγκη- | κας 'stumbling by painful constraint and compulsion', i.e. 'forced to stumble painfully', responding to 206–7 στίβον κατ' ἀνάγκη- | καν (ἔρποντος) at the same metrical position in the strophe. Cf. 829–30 εὐαίων, εὐαίων at the same metrical position as 844–5 βαιάν μοι | βαιάν, with 844–5n.

216–17 τηλωπὸν ἰω- | ἀν: cf. 189n. ἰωή, an epic word occurring only here in tragedy, is used by Homer of natural sounds (e.g. *Il.* 4.276, wind; 16.127, fire; 10.139, of the sound of human speech), and of the sound of the lyre (*Od.* 17.261, *HH Hermes* 421). Possibly ἰω- | ἀν indicates that the Chorus hear Phil. calling ἰώ, as in 219 ἰώ ξένοι.

217–18 ναὸς... ὄρμον 'gazing at an anchorage that is inhospitable to a ship', i.e. that has no ship as its guest, with ναὸς governed by ἄξενον. The Chorus think that Phil.'s cry is caused either by physical pain (cf. 215–16) or by emotional distress as he gazes out at the empty sea. This is preferable to taking ναὸς... ὄρμον as 'gazing at the inhospitable anchorage of our ship', with ναὸς understood as obj. gen. dependent on ὄρμον, which would imply that Phil.'s cry is a response to his having caught sight of the ship. Since Phil. enters the cave through the mouth facing away from the sea, it is unlikely that he would have seen the ship, especially if 216–17 ἰω- | ἀν refers to a sound he has just made, but in returning to the cave he might have glimpsed the sea in a different direction from where the ship is anchored.

218 προβοᾷ... δεινόν: τι... δεινόν is adverbial acc. with προβοᾷ, a verb occurring only here and at *Il.* 12.277. For the placement of γάρ after the enclitic, cf. Eur. *Supp.* 99 προσδοκῶ τι γὰρ νέον, *IT* 1036 ὑποπτεύω τι γάρ. In tragedy γάρ can come third, fourth, or even later in its clause, when the words preceding it are thought of as cohering so closely as to form a kind of unity (*GP* 95–6). Lachmann's προβοᾷ γὰρ αἴλινον, accepted by several recent editors, would restore metrical respension without requiring any change in 209 and could be correct. Elsewhere in tragedy this ritual cry of grief for the dead, is usually doubled (αἴλινον, αἴλινον), cf. *Aj.* 627, *Aesch. Ag.* 121, 139, 159, Eur. *Or.* 1395, but there is single αἴλινον at Eur. *Her.* 348, *Pho.* 1519.

219–675: FIRST EPEISODION

The long scene between the *parodos* and the *stasimon* at 676–729 has three main sections: 219–541, in which Ne., supported by the Chorus, deceives Phil.,

successfully gains his trust, and falsely promises to bring him home; 542–627, the scene with the False Merchant (FM); 628–75, in which Ne. and Phil. hurriedly prepare to depart and express their reciprocal friendship, Phil. promises that Ne. ‘alone of mortals’ will be able, ‘on account of his excellence’ (669 ἀρετῆς ἕκαστι), to touch the bow of Herakles and boast that he received and returned it, and Ne. declares that he is glad to have met Phil. and taken him as a friend, since his knowledge of how to return kindness for kindness makes him ‘a friend better than any possession’ (673 παντὸς . . . κτήματος κρείσσω φίλος).

The first of these three sections is itself divided into three parts by the strophe and antistrophe at 391–402 and 507–18, respectively: in 220–390 Ne. hears Phil.’s story and tells his lying tale of mistreatment by Od. and the sons of Atreus; in 403–506 Phil. accepts Ne. as a fellow victim, receives corroborative detail concerning events at Troy, and supplicates him to ‘pity’ and ‘save’ him (501 ἐλέησον, σῶσον) by bringing him home; in 518–38, Ne. pretends reluctance but eventually agrees to Phil.’s (and the Chorus’) request; they are ready to depart, when the Chorus see the False Merchant approaching (539–41).

219–53 Phil. appears suddenly at the mouth of his cave, carrying the bow and arrows of Herakles, and joyfully greets Ne. and the Chorus. As they converse, Phil. learns Ne.’s identity and is surprised and dismayed to learn that Ne. apparently does not know who he is. During their exchange, Phil. makes his way down from the higher level on which the opening of the cave is located to the *orchēstra* (or possibly to the raised platform at the rear of the *orchēstra*, just in front of the *skēnē*), perhaps moving in stages between 221 and 222, 224 and 225, and 229 and 230. See *Introd.*, pp. 13–14. Phil.’s hair is long and matted; he limps on his diseased foot, wears torn and filthy clothes, and has a wild and savage appearance (226 ἀπηγριωμένον).

219 *ἰὼ ξένοι*: an exclamation *extra metrum* (‘outside the metre’) or perhaps to be thought of as a line consisting of a single iambic metron, cf. 736, 746. *ἰὼ*, with or without a noun, can express various kinds of strong excitement or emotion, including suffering or grief (e.g. 759, *Ant.* 850 *ἰὼ δύστανος*, *OC* 198 *ἰὼ μοί μοι*); sometimes it is used in calling on the gods for assistance (e.g. 736, *Tr.* 221, *Aesch. Sept.* 97, *Eur. Ba.* 578). At *OC* 822, *ἰὼ ξένοι* is part of Oed.’s desperate appeal to the Chorus for help against Kreon. Here it seems to be a cry of joy (cf. *Aj.* 694 *ἰὼ ἰὼ Πάν Πάν*), though if it is connected with 216–17 *ἰω- | άν*, perhaps it expresses physical pain. *ἰὼ* can be followed by the voc., nom., or gen. or, in the expression *ἰὼ μοι*, by the dat., cf. *οἱμοι*, *ὦμοι*.

220–1 *τίνες . . . κατέσχετ’*: in questions *ποτε* often has generalizing and intensifying force: ‘who ever’, ‘who *in the world* . . .’? Cf. 1206, *Aj.* 1290 *ποῖ βλέπω ν ποτ’ αὐτὰ καὶ θροεῖς*; *OT* 335 *ἐξερεῖς ποτε; κατέχω* (*sc.* *ναῦν*) *εἰς* is the usual idiom for ‘putting in’ (from the sea) to shore, as to a final destination (cf. 270, *LSJ s.v.* b2), but the prep. can be omitted, e.g. *Eur. Hel.* 1206 *κατέσχε γῆν*, *Cyc.* 223 *κατέσχον . . . χθόνα*. By contrast, *προσέχω* (cf. 244) suggests ‘touch at’ *en route* to a

further destination. For a metaphorical use of κατέχω, cf. *El.* 503 εὖ κατασχήσει 'will come safe to land', i.e. 'will have a fortunate outcome'. ναυτίλωι πλάττη 'with a naval oar-blade', i.e., synecdochally, 'by ship'; cf. *Ar. Ran.* 1207-8 ναυτίλωι πλάττη | Ἄργος κατασχών, according to a scholiast on *Ran.* 1206 from the beginning of Eur. *Archelaos*. Cf. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5.1: 315 on Eur. fr. 228; 5.2: 885 on Eur. fr. 846.

221 οὐτ'... οἰκουμένην: cf. 2 ἄστιπτον οὐτ' οἰκουμένην. Phil. associates the land's being uninhabited with its lack of a good anchorage', *Od.*, with its being 'untrodden'.

222-3 ποίᾱς... εἰπών 'saying that you are from what country or lineage might I hit the mark' (i.e. 'might I be correct')? Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 622 πῶς δῆτ' ἂν εἰπών κέδνα τάληθῇ τύχοις; κυρέω is used in a similar construction, e.g. *El.* 663-4 ἦ καὶ δάμαρτα τήνδ' ἐπεικάζων κυρῶ | κείνου; With ὑμᾶς, obj. of εἰπών, sc. ὄντας governing ποίᾱς πάτρας... ἦ γένους, gen. of source or origin; cf. 3, *Ani.* 38 εἴτ' εὐγενῆς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλῶν κακῇ (cf. Smyth §§1410, 1411b, Moorhouse 66). ἂν... ἂν: ἂν tends to come at two places in its clause: (1) like enclitics and other postpositives, as the second word or as close to the beginning as possible; (2) next to the verb (or adverb, etc.) it modifies. When both tendencies assert themselves strongly, ἂν can occur twice or even three times in the same sentence, especially a long sentence, where it can make the conditional force felt throughout or place rhetorical emphasis on a particular word. Cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 270, Smyth §1765, *GMT* §223, Jebb on *OT* 339.

223-4 σχῆμα... ἐμοί 'the appearance of your clothing is Greek, (the clothing) most dear to me'. For σχῆμα (cf. 952 with n.) referring to clothing or costume, cf. Eur. *Ba.* 832 σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου. Certain items of clothing, such as the χιτῶν and ἱμάτιον, were considered distinctively Greek. For recognition by non-Greek clothing, cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 234-7. Ἑλλάδος has the force of an adj. (cf. 256), as geographical and ethnic proper names often do (Smyth §1142c, K-G II.272). προσφιλεστάτης is a powerful word, both by its position in the sentence and owing to the rarity of προσφιλέης and related words. (There are only nine instances in Soph.'s plays and fragments, of which six occur in *Ph.*, four spoken by Phil. The superlative is found elsewhere only at Eur. *Supp.* 489 and fr. 448A.14.

225 φωνῆς δ' picks up 224 σχῆμα μέν. For the combination of distinctively Greek clothing and speech, cf. [Xen.] *Ath.* 2.8 καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἰδία μάλλον καὶ φωνῇ καὶ διαίτη καὶ σχήματι χρώνται. Non-Greeks are βαρβαρόφωνοι at *Il.* 2.867 and, according to Aesch. fr. 450, 'twitter like swallows' (χελιδονίειν, cf. *Ag.* 1050-1 of *Kassandra* εἴπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην | ἀγνώτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη).

225-6 καὶ... ἀπηγριωμένον: the strong sense break after βούλομαι at position 8 suggests that Phil. waits expectantly, after saying that he wishes to hear a voice, then, when there is no reply, continues by urging Ne. and the Chorus not to be dumbstruck with fear at his savage appearance. δκνω goes

with both δέισαντες (cf. *OC* 1625 φόβωι δέισαντες) and μή... ἐκπλαγῆτ' (cf. *Eur. IA* 1535 ταρβοῦσα τλήμων κάκτεπληγμένη φόβωι). 226 is marked (and therefore emphatic), because (1) it is a rare three-word trimeter, (2) its second half is filled by a single word, ἀπηγριωμένον, which does not occur elsewhere in extant Greek poetry, and (3) ἐκπλαγῆτ' overflows the normal caesura at position 5 and ends in quasi-middle caesura at position 6 (cf. 101 with n., 297, 741, 746, 1064, 1369; *OT* 738 ὦ Ζεῦ, τί μου δρᾶσαι βεβούλευσαι πέρι; *EL* 330 κοῦδ' ἐν χρόνωι μακρῶι διδαχθῆναι θέλεις). ἀπ- has an intensifying force and, like Phil.'s wild appearance, suggests that he has declined into savagery from a previously civilized condition. On the other hand, his desire to hear a human voice speaking Greek reflects a desire for pity and human solidarity (cf. 227 οἰκτίσαντες, 229 φίλοι) that is far from savage. Cf. Robinson 2013, ch. 2, Hall 2012: 156–7.

227–9 ἀλλ'... προσήκετε: Phil. further defines his mistreatment (228 κακούμενον) in terms of his wretched isolation, alone and without friends or community. Because, in Aristotle's formulation of what was doubtless a common notion, being human involves 'living in a community' (*Arist. Pol.* 1253a2–3 ὁ ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον), Phil. describes himself as a man (ἄνδρα) who has been treated inhumanly. His desire for communication, pity, and friendship is thus a desire for a restored humanity. ἔρημος is a more emotional term than μόνος (cf. 170–2n.). It recurs in Phil.'s description of his isolation at 265, 269, 471, 487, 1018, 1070, and is again joined with μόνος, in forceful asyndeton, at 470–1.

230 ἀλλ' ἀνταμείψασθ': after further silence on the part of Ne. and the Chorus, Phil. renews his appeal. ἀλλά is frequently used with an imperative, usually in the second person, to reiterate a previous appeal in the face of reluctance or indecision; sometimes it is repeated, as here (227, 230), after a relatively short interval (*GP* 13–15).

230–1 οὐ γάρ... ἐμοῦ 'it is not reasonable that I fail, in this respect at least, (to obtain this) from you or you from me'. ἀμαρτεῖν, here the equivalent of οὐ τυγχάνειν, governs the gen.; τοῦτο is adv. acc. of respect, analogous to the adv. acc. neut. plur. of pronouns and adjectives used with τυγχάνειν or κυρεῖν. Cf. 509 ἄθλ' οἷα μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν τύχοι φίλων, K–G 1: 350 Anm. 9. ἐμὲ and ἐμοῦ suggest that despite his suffering, Phil. retains a strong sense of his own worth.

232 ἀλλ': a case of 'assentient' ἀλλά, suggesting that a person asked to speak is ready and willing to do so. ἀλλά also can suggest willingness to act in a particular way, e.g. 48, 645, 1407 (*GP* 17–18).

232–3 ὦ ξέν'... μαθεῖν: Ne. responds strategically to Phil.'s ἰὼ ξένοι, cultivating a personal relationship that will help in his intrigue. His two lines seem rather cold, guarded, and distant in contrast to Phil.'s warm, effusive greeting: 'not a word of pity, nor of horror at what he sees, not a single expression of simple humanity' (Kamerbeek: 57). οὐνεκα (or, usually before a vowel, οὐνεκεν) is a relative conjunction formed by contraction from οὐ ἔνεκα. οὐνεκα in Homer and οὐνεκα and ὁθούνεκα in tragedy are sometimes used, as here, as the

equivalent of *οτι* or *ως* to introduce dependent clauses. Cf. *Tr.* 934–5 *δψ' ἐκδι-
δαχθεις τῶν κατ' οἶκον οὔνεκα* | *ἀκουσα πρὸς τοῦ θηρὸς ἔρξαιεν τάδε*, *El.* 47–8
ἄγγελε... ὀθούνεκα | *τέθηνκ' Ὀρέστης*, *GMT* §710, Smyth §2578e, f. *οὔνεκα*
can also be used with the gen. as the equivalent of *ἐνεκα* (or Ionic *εἴνεκα*) 'on
account of', 'because of', e.g. 774 *προνοίας οὔνεκ'.* **Ἑλληνες... μαθεῖν:**

cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 134 *Ἀργεῖός εἰμι· τοῦτο γὰρ θέλεις μαθεῖν.* For the technically
anachronistic *Ἑλληνες*, cf. 3n.

234 *ὦ... φώνημα:* while 225 *φωνῆς* and 229 *φωνήσατε* refer prospec-
tively to the articulated sound of Greek, *φώνημα* and 235 *πρόσφθεγμα* denote
an utterance that has actually been voiced. (Cf. *Introd.*, p. 32.) For abstract *-μα*
nouns used in apostrophes to express happiness or joy, cf. *Aj.* 14–16 *ὦ φθέγμ'
Ἀθάνας... φώνημ' ἀκούω*, Aesch. *Ch.* 235–8 *ὦ φίλτατον μέλημα δώμασιν
πατρός, |...| ὦ τερπνὸν ὄμμα*, Eur. *Alc.* 1133 *ὦ φιλτάτης γυναικὸς ὄμμα.*
Cf. Long 1968: 124–5.

234–5 *φεῦ... μακρῶι:* for *φεῦ* in exclamations of approval or joy, cf. Eur.
El. 262 *φεῦ· | γενναῖον ἄνδρ' ἔλεξας*, Ar. *Av.* 1724 *ὦ φεῦ φεῦ τῆς ὥρας, τοῦ
κόλλους.* The articular inf., like the simple inf., can be used in a variety of
emotional exclamations (Smyth §2036, *GMT* §805) and is a colloquial touch, cf.
Ar. *Av.* 5–6 *τὸ... ἐμὲ... περιελθεῖν*, 7–8 *τὸ... ἐμὲ... ἀποσποδῆσαι*, *Ran.* 741
τὸ... μὴ πατάξαι. See Stevens 1976: 61. For adverbial *καί* between the article
and the inf. in an exclamation, cf. Eur. *Med.* 1051–2 *ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμῆς κακῆς, | τὸ
καί προσέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί* 'but what cowardice on my part, that
I actually allowed mild and cowardly words in my mind!' **τοιοῦδ' ἄνδρός**
perhaps refers not only to Ne.'s being Greek but to his apparently noble birth
and breeding.

ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῶι '(at last) after a long time', cf. *Ant.* 422 *καί
τοῦδ' ἀπαλλαγέντος ἐν μακρῶι χρόνῳ*, *OC* 88 *ταύτην ἔλεξε παῦλαν ἐν χρόνῳ
μακρῶι.* *χρόνῳ* without *ἐν* can have the same sense, e.g. *Tr.* 227–8 *χρόνῳ |
πολλῶι φανέντα*, *El.* 1283 *χρόνῳ μακρῶι.* See Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 165–6
περὶ δ' ὠλένας | δέροι φιλτάται βαλοῦμεν χρόνῳ.

236–7 *τίς... φίλτατος* 'what (need), my child, made you put in here, what
need brought you to (this place)? What impulse? What of winds the dearest?'
The four *τίς* questions in two lines express Phil.'s excitement and urgency. He
immediately calls Ne. *τέκνον*, instinctively claiming and establishing a special
relationship with him. With *φίλτατος*, understand *ἐμοί*, cf. 242. The definite
article with the superlative is particularly emphatic, cf. *Ant.* 100–1 *τὸ κάλ-
| λιστον ἐπταπύλου φανέν | Θήβαι τῶν προτέρων φάος.* **προσέσχε:** cf.
220n. Phil. implies that Ne. and his men had not been heading for Lemnos itself
but were on their way to another destination, cf. 243–4, 301–4.

238 *τοῦθ'* gains emphasis from the strong sense break at position 6 of the
trimeter.

239–41 *ἐγὼ... πᾶν:* the sequence *μὲν... δέ... δέ...* may connect sev-
eral predicates or several actions attributed to the same subject (here *ἐγὼ*) with
little or no antithesis or contrast (Smyth §2905, K–G II.266b). *γένος* is acc. of

respect. τῆς περριρύτου Σκύρου is pred. gen., indicating ‘connection to’ or ‘association with’ the noun or pronoun it limits by means of a verb (Smyth §1303, Moorhouse 51). Cf. *OT* 236–7 τὸν ἄνδρ’ . . . τοῦτον, ὅστις ἐστί, γῆς | τῆςδ’, Pl. *Prot.* 316b8–9 ἵπποκράτης . . . ἐστί . . . οἰκίας μεγάλης. Skyros, where Ne. was born, is an Aegean island about 35 miles east of Euboea and 75 miles south-southwest of Lemnos. οἶσθ’ ἤδη τὸ πᾶν: cf. 389 λόγος λέλεκται πᾶς, *El.* 680 τὸ πᾶν φράσω. In all three cases, the speaker is being disingenuous. Here, despite his matter-of-fact assurance, Phil. does not ‘now know everything’, any more than in 389 ‘the whole story has been told’. 1240 εὖ νῦν ἐπίστω πᾶντ’ ἀκηκῶς λόγον is somewhat different, because there Ne., in expressing his resolve to return the bow, really has said everything he has to say. Cf. *Aj.* 480 πᾶντ’ ἀκήκας λόγον.

242–3 ὦ . . . Λυκομήδους: Lykomedes was King of Skyros and father of Deidamia, Ne.’s mother. Phil.’s exuberant triple apostrophe expresses his excitement and elevates his own standing, as a friend of Achilles. Both πατρός and χθονός are pred. gen. after πᾶι (cf. 239–41n.); cf. *Ant.* 379–80 ὦ δύστηνος καὶ δυστήνου | πατρός. With φιλάτου and φίλης, understand ἐμοί, cf. 237.

244 στόλῳι . . . γῆν ‘you touched at this land with what expedition (i.e. ‘on what errand’)’? Cf. 247 τοῦ πρὸς Ἴλιον στόλῳ. For προσέσχες, cf. 220–1n., 236–7n.

245 ἐξ Ἰλίου . . . ναυστολῶ: ‘from Ilion then, I tell you, I am *now* sailing’. Possibly these words echo *Od.* 9.39 Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων, the beginning of Odysseus’ first-person narrative of his wanderings to the Phaeacians, and 9.259 ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλαγχθέντες Ἀχαιοί, the opening of Odysseus’ partly true, partly false account to Polyphemos of who he is and where he and his men have come from. The echo would suggest to an audience or reader familiar with *Od.* 9 that Ne., as Od.’s agent, is speaking Od.’s words. τοι δῆ: the particle τοι implies a person being addressed, to whom the speaker tells or explains something of which that person was previously ignorant and, in so doing, establishes (or tries to establish) a close rapport. τοι probably originated as the dat. of σύ, used in intimate address and indicating close involvement or concern (ethical dat., cf. 261, 433); see *GP* 537, Smyth §1486. δῆ emphasizes the entire preceding clause. There is a tension between the ‘easy, ready tone’ (Jebb) produced by the particles and the emphatic ending of the rhetorical/semantic unit with δῆ at position 6 of the trimeter, virtually bisecting the line before τανῦν γε ναυστολῶ. Perhaps this tension reflects an anxiety on Ne.’s part that Phil. may somehow see through his lie. Cf. *OT* 1171 κείνου γέ τοι δῆ παῖς ἐκλήιζεθ’.

246 πῶς εἶπας expresses Phil.’s astonishment at Ne.’s mention of Ilion (cf. Σ θαυμάζων).

246–7 οὐ γὰρ δῆ . . . στόλου: οὐ γὰρ δῆ, especially when followed by γε, ‘clears the ground by ruling out at least one possibility’ (*GP* 243), cf. *OC* 110–11 οἰκτίρατ’ . . . τόδ’ ἄθλιον | εἶδωλον· οὐ γὰρ δῆ τό γ’ ἀρχαῖον δέμας. κατ’ ἀρχήν can go adverbially with οὐ . . . ᾔσθα (‘you were not, in the first

place') and with τοῦ . . . στόλου ('at the beginning of the expedition'). The word-order favours the latter interpretation, and presumably an actor would clarify in performance what is ambiguous to a reader. ναυβάτης | ἡμῖν 'our shipmate'. ἡμῖν is dat. of interest suggesting both possession and advantage (Smyth §§1476, 1481).

248 ἦ γάρ: The combination ἦ γάρ is used in elliptical, eager questions that seek confirmation of an inference from the previous speaker's words. ἦ is interrogative and γάρ, causal: 'because of what you say, I ask . . .'. Cf. 322, 654, *OT* 1000 ἦ γάρ τόδ' ὀκνῶν κείθεν ἦσθ' ἀπόπτολις; 'Sometimes a γάρ question in response to a preceding question' (here, πῶς εἶπας); indicates 'surprised recognition' of the reason for that question (*GP*: 78–9). Here, of course, Ne.'s 'surprised recognition' is calculated to further his deception of Phil.

249 οὐ γάρ . . . εἰσορᾷς; '(do you ask because) you don't know me at whom you are looking'? γάρ is causal as in 248, cf. *K–G* II: 335–6). Ὡ

τέκνον: cf. 236 with n.

250 πῶς γάρ . . . οὐδεπώποτε: a third consecutive interrogative answer with γάρ: '(I ask because) how do I know someone whom I've never, ever seen'? κάτοιδα responds to οἶσθα in the previous line, cf. *El.* 923 πῶς δ' οὐκ ἐγὼ κάτοιδ' ἅ γ' εἶδον ἐμφανῶς, 'How do I not know what I have seen clearly?', responding to *El.* 922 οὐκ οἶσθ'.

251–2 οὐδ' ὄνομ' (ἄρ) . . . διωλλύμην lit. 'then (ἄρ) you have never at all learned not even my name, not even (heard) the rumor (κλέος) of my evils by which I was being utterly destroyed'? Phil. had somehow expected that even though Ne. had never seen him, he would know his name and story well enough to realize whom he was encountering on Lemnos. Erfurd's ἄρ' nicely suggests the light dawning on Phil. and avoids an ionicism, οὐνομ', that occurs nowhere in extant tragic dialogue. For διωλλύμην at the end of the line – a strong word in an emphatic position – cf. *Tr.* 1052, *OT* 1159, *El.* 679. The imperf. expresses Phil.'s continuing and endless 'being destroyed' (cf. 311–13); the prefix δι-, as often, has an intensifying force ('utterly').

253 ὥς μηδὲν εἰδότε ἴσθι μ' 'understand that (you must look upon) me as knowing nothing'. ὥς with a participle in indirect discourse makes clear that the thought or viewpoint is that of the subject of the main verb (Smyth §2120, *GMT* §916). For generic μηδὲν (rather than οὐδέν), cf. 415n. on μηκέτ'.

254–316 Phil.'s long *rhapsis* in response to Ne.'s assertion of ignorance consists of three unequal parts: (1) he identifies himself and tells how he was abandoned on Lemnos by Od. and the sons of Atreus (254–84); (2) he describes his means of survival and gruelling way of life (285–99); (3) he tells how the few visitors to the island pitied him but refused to save him by bringing him home (300–16). After Phil. identifies himself by name and as 'master of the Heraklean arms' (263), the following fifty lines are framed by his blame and bitter hatred of Odysseus and the sons of Atreus (263–4/314–15), on whom he wishes the kind of suffering he himself has endured (275/315–16).

254–84 The first section of Phil.'s *rhēsis* is highly emotional, an effect created by its rhetorical figures (e.g. anaphora 261–3, 276–8; apostrophe 260, 300, 307, 315; *figura etymologica* 276–7; rhetorical questions 276–7, 278) and significant verbal repetition (254 ὦ . . . ὦ . . . 260 ὦ . . . ὦ, 255 μηδέ . . . 256 μηδ' . . . μηδαμοῦ, 265 ἔρημον . . . 269 ἔρημον, 268 προθέντες . . . 274 προθέντες, 269 ὦιχοντ' . . . 273 ὦιχονθ', 273 οἶα . . . 275 οἶ, 276 ποίαν . . . 278 ποῖ . . . ποῖ, 277 βεβώτων . . . 280 βεβώσας, 280–1 οὐδέν' . . . , | οὐχ ὅστις . . . 281 οὐδ' ὅστις, 260, 276, 284, 300, 307 τέκνον, 268 παῖ . . . 315 παῖ).

254–6 ὦ πολλ' . . . δίηλθέ πω: Phil. begins with an emotional double exclamation, which is rhetorically balanced by his invocation of Ne. in 260 ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ. By convention, ὦ is accented with the circumflex when it precedes an address to someone or something and with the acute/grave when it is part of an exclamation, though the distinction is not always easy to make. ὦ

πολλ' ἐγὼ μοχθηρός: cf. *Tr.* 1046–7 ὦ πολλὰ δὴ κακά . . . μοχθήσας ἐγὼ. For πολλὰ 'very' with an adj., cf. *Anl.* 1046 χοῖ πολλὰ δεινοί, *El.* 1326 ὦ πλείστα μῶροι. Cf. *Aj.* 911 ὁ πάντα κωφός, *OC* 1458 τὸν πάντ' ἄριστον. ὦ πικρός

θεοῖς: 'bitterly hated by (i.e. 'enemy to') the gods', cf. Eur. *Pho.* 955–6 εἰ μὲν ἐχθρὰ σημήνας τύχηι, | πικρὸς καθέστηχ' οἷς ἂν οἰωνοσκοπῇ ('if he [*sic* a seer] happens to have proclaimed hateful things, he has made himself bitterly hated by those for whom he interprets omens'). Cf. the common and perhaps colloquial ἐχθρὸς θεοῖς, e.g. Hes. *Th.* 766, *Theogn.* 601, Ar. *Eq.* 34. Cf. *Aj.* 457–8 θεοῖς | ἐχθαίρομαι, *OT* 1345–6 θεοῖς | ἐχθρότατον βροτῶν, 1519 θεοῖς γ' ἐχθιστος. πικρός also can have the active sense 'bitterly hostile toward,' e.g. 355 πικρὸν Σιγείον, *Aj.* 1359 ἡ κάρτα πολλοὶ νῦν φίλοι καὺθις πικροί. οὐ . . . δίηλθέ

πω 'of whom, though being in this condition (ὥδ' ἔχοντος) not even a word has yet (πω) come through to my home and not even (a word has come through) to anywhere in Greece'. μη(δέ) is generic, cf. 170–2n., 714 (also a rel. clause). For κληδών 'word' in the sense of 'news', 'tidings' (*LSJ s.v.* II.1) and governing a gen., cf. *Od.* 4.317 κληδὼν πατρός. κληδών is cognate with κλέος, κλύω (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 863 κλύουσσαν κληδόνας) and can denote (and here suggests) 'fame', 'repute', 'glory', cf. *OC* 258–9 τί κληδόνος καλῆς | μάτην ῥεούσης ὠφέλημα γίνεταί; See *LSJ s.v.* κληδών II.2. μηδαμοῦ normally means 'nowhere', 'no place', but

is here used, by way of variation on οἶκαδε (i.e. Malis), to denote the end of the motion in διηλθέ πω. Cf. *El.* 1099 ὁδοιποροῦμεν ἔνθα (= οἶ) χρῆζομεν, *OC* 1019 ὁδοῦ κατάρχειν τῆς ἐκεῖ (= ἐκεῖσε). For the gen. Ἑλλάδος γῆς with μηδαμοῦ, cf. 204 τὰ τόπων with n. πω has particular force, given the length of time

implied by Phil. (cf. 285). It is preferable to the relatively bland πον, the reading of most MSS, which would mean 'I suppose' and could not be understood as reinforcing μηδαμοῦ ('to no place whatsoever').

257–9 οἱ μὲν . . . ἡ δ' . . . νόσος . . . ἐρχεται: Phil. contrasts the silent laughter of those who impiously 'threw me away' to his disease which has 'flow-ered and constantly becomes greater'. ἐκβάλλω, here used of abandoning Phil. (cf. 1034, 1390), can also be used of 'exposing' newborn children, e.g. Eur. *Ion*

954; cf. 4 ἐξέθηκ', 265 ἔρριψαν). In Homer ἐκβάλλω signifies to throw someone from a ship into the sea (*Od.* 15.481) or to abandon them ashore (*Od.* 19.278); it also can mean 'drive out' or 'banish' from a community, e.g. *OC* 646, 770. All these senses and associations of ἐκβάλλω are in play here. Cf. 265 ἔρριψαν with n.

ἀνοσίως ἐμέ: ἀνοσίως in effect contradicts *Od.*'s claim (8–10) that religious considerations led the Greeks to maroon him. ἐμέ is emphatic by its position at the end of the participial phrase and of the line.

γελῶσι σῖγ' ἔχοντες: Phil.'s pain is grounded in two heroic imperatives: the need to avoid the shaming laughter of enemies (cf. *Aj.* 454, 955–8, 961–2; *Eur. Med.* 323, 404, 797) and the wish to acquire fame (κλέος) by being spoken or sung about as widely as possible (cf. 261 δὲ κλύεις ἴσως).

τέθηλε contributes to the sense that the νόσος is a 'living thing'. θάλλω (and more frequently ἀνθέω) can be used metaphorically of burgeoning evils, e.g. *El.* 260 (πατρῶια πτήματα) θάλλοντα μᾶλλον ἢ καταφθίνοντ' ὀρώ, *Tr.* 1089 (νόσος) ἤνθηκεν, fr. 786.3 (ὕβρις) ἐν νεοῖς ἀνθεῖ τε καὶ πάλιν φθίνει.

κάπῃ μείζον ἔρχεται 'and becomes greater', i.e. 'increases'. Cf. *El.* 1000 (δαίμων) κάπῃ μῆδ' ἐρχεται, *OT* 638 μὴ τὸ μῆδ' ἄλγος εἰς μέγ' οἴσετε, fr. 441a.11 (from *Niobe*) ἐπὶ μέγα τόδε φλ[ύει κα]κόν.

260–70 consist of a single, intensely emotional sentence with frequent enjambment; only three lines end with a sense pause strong enough to be marked by punctuation. The enjambments in 263–6, in particular, express the emotional urgency and indignation which drive Phil. to tell his story without, as it were, pausing for breath.

260 ὦ τέκνον... Ἀχιλλέως: the double *apostrophe* shows Phil.'s urgency: in calling Ne. 'son of Achilles as a father', Phil. reminds him of his noble heritage, and in calling him 'child', Phil. in effect competes with *Od.* to claim Ne. as his 'son' (cf. 79 παῖ). Phil., however, speaks spontaneously and does not calculatedly try to ingratiate himself with Ne. as *Od.* does, when he calls him 'son of Achilles' in 3–4 and 50. Cf. Rutherford 2012: 104–5.

παῖ πατρός ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως: cf. *Ant.* 193 παίδων τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίου, 466–7 τὸν ἐξ ἡμῖς | μητρος.

261 ὁδ' εἰμ' ἐγὼ σοι κείνος 'here I am before you (ethical dat., cf. 245n.), that man'. The elaborate expression, with κείνος looking forward to the extended self-identification in 261–7, conveys Phil.'s sense of his own most important attribute and achievement: he is 'master of the Heraklean arms' (262), which he received as a gift for lighting Herakles' pyre on Mt Oita (cf. 801–3). *OC* 138 ὁδ' ἐκεῖνος ἐγὼ is simpler and self-contained, with its climactic ἐγὼ 'here, I am that man (you're looking for)'. ἴσως expresses understated confidence rather than modesty.

261–3 ὁν... ὁν...: both relatives refer to the same man, though the first has ἐκεῖνος as its antecedent, the second, Φιλοκλήτης, in apposition to ἐκεῖνος. The anaphora expresses Phil.'s heightened emotion as he refers in one clause to what should be the source of his heroic glory (cf. 261 κλύεις, cognate with κλέος) and in the next to the men who have mistreated him and robbed him of this glory. For the verb of hearing in the pres. with perf. meaning, cf. *Tr.* 68, 72. For

enjambment with the def. article at the end of the line and the substantive at the beginning of the next, cf. *Ant.* 409 τὸν | νέκυν, *El.* 879 τοῖς | . . . κακοῖσι, *OC* 351 τῆς | . . . διαίτης. Cf. 337–8 τὸ σὸν | πάθῃμ' with n. ὁ . . . Φιλοκτῆτης:
cf. 4n.

264 ὁ Κεφαλλήνων ἀναξ: cf. 791 ὦ ξένε Κεφάλλῃν. Presumably, Phil. is being disrespectful, even sarcastic, in both passages; cf. his disparaging use of Sisyphos as Od.'s father at 417, 1311. There are, however, no other examples in extant Greek literature of Od. being mocked as 'Kephallenian', while he is disparaged as the son of Sisyphos at *Aj.* 189, fr. 567.1, Aesch. fr. 175.1, Eur. *Cyc.* 104, *La* 524, 1362. In *Il.* 2.631–4 Od. is said to lead the 'great-hearted Kephallenians' who hold Ithaca, Zakynthos, and Samos (i.e. Kephallenia), cf. *Il.* 4.330, *Od.* 24.378.

265 ἔρριψαν . . . ἔρημον repeats 257 ἐκβαλόντες ἀνοσίως in more emotional terms appropriate to casting out a corpse unburied, 'exposing' an infant destined to die (cf. 5 ἐξέθηκ'), or expulsion from a community (cf. *Aj.* 830 ριφθῶ κυσὶν πρόβλητος οἰωνοῖς θ' ἔλωρ, *OT* 718–19 καὶ νιν . . . κείνος . . . | ἔρριπεν . . . εἰς ἄβαντον ὄρος, 1436 ῥίψον με γῆς ἐκ τῆσδ'). As often, ὧδ' implies a deictic gesture that would intensify the force of ἔρημον, which by itself arouses pity through its sense of inhuman desolation. Cf. 470–1n.

265–7 ἀγρίαι . . . χαράγματι 'wasting away from a savage disease, struck by the savage mark of the man-destroying serpent'. In these lines, which flow together into a single unit by enjambment, Phil. virtually explodes with impassioned emphasis on the savagery of the disease caused by the savage serpent. καταφθί(ν)ω, an epic word (e.g. *Il.* 22.288, *Od.* 3.196, 4.363, 5.341, 11.491), denotes a natural wasting or waning (Chantraine, *DELG* s.v. φθίνω, φθινύθω), here the result of the snakebite. Repeated ἄγριος emphasizes the process by which Phil. himself has become savage (cf. 226 ἀπηγριωμένον, 1321 ἡγρίωσαι). χάραγμα can denote any mark that is scratched, cut, engraved, branded, or imprinted; here it probably refers to the actual bite of the serpent rather than to a residual scar. Soph. has relatively few abstract -μα nouns (usually indicating the result of an action) compared with Aesch. or Eur. (Palmer 1980: 137). Many, like χαράγματι, are placed at the end of the trimeter and denote violent action, e.g. *Aj.* 634 ἄμυγμα, *Ant.* 1081 σπαράγματι, *Ant.* 1281 πλήγμασιν, *Tr.* 522 πλήγματα, *OT* 1318 οἰστρημα, fr. 623 μασχαλισμάτων, fr. 841 δῆγμα. Cf. 234n., Long 1968: 38, 44).

ἐχίδνης: Phil. refers to the serpent that bit him in language with unusual resonance. At Hes. *Th.* 297, 304 Ἐχίδνα is the proper name of a monstrous daughter of Keto and Phorkys, 'half a nymph with sparkling eyes and fair cheeks, | half a monstrous serpent, terrible and huge, | glittering and eating raw flesh in the depths of the sacred earth. | There is her cave under a hollow rock | far from immortal gods and mortal human beings' (*Th.* 298–300; cf. Bacchyl. 5.62, *Tr.* 1099). Echidna is the mother by Typhon of the dog Orthos, Kerberos, and the Hydra, and the mother or grandmother (the text is unclear) of the monstrous Chimaira (Hes. *Th.* 309–15, 319–22), all of whom are eventually killed or

defeated by Herakles. In *Ant.* 531–2 Kreon compares Ismene to an ἐχίδνα ‘lurking in (my house)’ and ‘secretly drinking up (my) lifeblood’, and at Aesch. *Cho.* 247–9 Orestes calls Klytaimestra ‘a terrible *echidna*’ in whose ‘twisted coils’ his father died (πατρός | θανόντος ἐν πλεκταΐσι καὶ σπειράμασιν | δεινῆς ἐχίδνης), using language that associates the snake’s coils with the net-like robe in which Klytaimestra trapped Agamemnon. Thus Phil. describes the ‘man-destroying’ (ἀνδροφθόρου) serpent in language suggesting something monstrously savage, chthonic, and distinctively female, just as he personifies his disease as female at 758–9, 807–8.

268 ξὺν ἡί μ': *sc.* συνόντα. Phil. speaks of the disease as something separate from himself, with which he lives, cf. 1022 ζῶ σὺν πολλοῖς κακοῖς τάλας.

268–9 προθέντες . . . ἔρημον: προτίθημι can be used of ‘exposing’ a child (Hdt. 1.112.3, cf. 5 ἐξέθηκ', 257 ἐκβαλόντες, 265 ἔρριψαν), ‘serving’ a corpse to dogs (*Il.* 24.409) or wild beasts (Eur. *El.* 896), and ‘laying out’ a corpse for burial (Eur. *Alc.* 664, *Supp.* 53, Ar. *Lys.* 611). For προθέντες . . . ὠιχοντ', see 273n. προθέντες expresses the main idea, but ὠιχοντ' ἔρημον is especially forceful, because it reverses the expected word-order (adj.-verb). The verb at the beginning of the line and the adj. at the caesura, followed by punctuation, suggest: ‘they *actually* went away (and left me behind) *alone*'.

270 Χρύσης: the island near Lemnos on which Phil. was bitten by the snake guarding the shrine of its eponymous goddess, cf. 1327, *Introd.*, pp. 1, 10. κατέσχον . . . στόλωι: cf. 221–2 ἐς γῆν τήνδε ναυτίλωι στόλωι / κατέσχετ'.

271 ἄσμενοι . . . εἶδον: Greek uses a pred. adj. in agreement with the subj. of the verb, where English would have an adverb.

271–2 ἐκ . . . ἄκτῆς ‘sleeping on the shore (cf. 1, 1017) after (and because of) much tossing at sea’, presumably on the crossing from Chryse to Lemnos. Cf. *Ant.* 163 πολλῶι σάλωι σείσαντες (where, however, the ‘tossing’ is metaphorical). For ἐκ = ‘after and because of’, cf. 1422 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τῶνδ'. For ἐκ ‘after’ with no causal sense, cf. *Ant.* 150 ἐκ πολέμων.

273 λιπόντες ὠιχονθ' ‘they left me behind (LSJ *s.v.* λείπω 1.2) and went away’. The supplementary participle is common with certain verbs of coming and going, e.g. οἴχομαι (cf. 269, 414), ἤκω, βαίνω, εἶμι, and ἔρχομαι (Smyth §2099, *GMT* §895). Usually the participle expresses the main idea, but here the repeated ὠιχονθ' (269, 273) emphasizes the departure of the men who abandoned Phil., and his incredulity at their action (cf. 268–9n.)

273–5 οἶα . . . συμικρόν ‘putting out a few rags of the sort (befitting) an ill-fated man (like me) and some small helping of food too’. ‘The first καὶ is copulative, the second adverbial’ (*GP* 293). For οἶα, cf. 293n. ἐπωφέλμα occurs only here in extant Greek literature, but ἐπωφελέω is common in tragedy, e.g. 905, *El.* 577–8 κείνον θέλων | ἐπωφελῆσαι, *OC* 441, 541. Presumably the sons of Atreus and Od. left Phil. just enough food to avoid the pollution they would incur if he were to die immediately of starvation. Cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 773–6. Phil.’s bitterness is expressed by an ironic *zeugma*, in which προθέντες, a word that in Homeric epic is used of

putting a meal before someone (e.g. *Od.* 1.112), governs both ῥάκη . . . βαιά and τι . . . ἐπωφέλημα σμικρόν. (As often, τι is disparaging.) βορά, which Phil. also uses disparagingly, is properly used of food eaten by carnivorous beasts (LSJ *s.v.*), rarely of human food. Throughout the play Phil.'s food is referred to in language appropriate to that of animals, e.g. 43, 162, 706, 711, 957, 1107, one indication of how he has become ἄγριος. Here, the word βορᾶς suggests that he was treated by the Greeks as a beast. Cf. 308–9n.

275 οἱ . . . τύχοι 'which sort of things – I wish they may happen to them', i.e. the meagre rags and food they provided for me. Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 5 δ μή γένοιτο 'which thing – I wish it may not happen'. The repetition of οἷα from 273 emphasizes Phil.'s virtual curse on the Greeks (cf. Σ καταρᾶται) – that they suffer the sort of miseries they inflicted on him.

276–84 σὺ . . . τέκνον 'and you, my child, what sort of rising up from sleep do you think I then rose (to), when they had gone? What sort of (tears) (do you think) I burst into, what sort of evils (do you think) I loudly lamented, seeing that the ships, with which I sailed, had all gone and that there was not a single man in the place who might help, and not (a single man) who might take hold of the disease with me (i.e. 'give me a helping hand with the disease') when I was suffering; looking everywhere I found nothing present except pain, but of this a great abundance, child'. μ' is acc. subj. of στήναι after δοκεῖς (and of 278 ἐκδακρῦσαι, ἀποιμῶσαι); it is artfully framed by the acc. obj. of στήναι, ποιάν . . . ἀνάστασιν. With ποῖ' ἐκδακρῦσαι, *sc.* δακρύα, cf. Eur. *Pho.* 1344 ὥστ' ἐκδακρῦσαί γ' with Mastronarde's note. Phil.'s series of personally pointed (276 σὺ δὴ, τέκνον, 284 ὦ τέκνον) rhetorical questions, as he concludes the first section of his *rhēsis*, calls for Ne.'s understanding and sympathy. The anaphora (ποιάν . . . ποῖ' . . . ποῖ', cf. 928–9) and cognate acc. (ἀνάστασιν . . . στήναι), reinforced by hyperbaton and by the emphatic quasi-middle caesura in 276 (ποιάν μ' at position 6 of the line, with no word-end at position 5 or 7), raise the emotional level; the emphatic repetition βεβῶτων . . . βεβώσας calls attention to Phil.'s isolation, with ships and men all gone; the final anaphora οὐχ ὅστις . . . οὐδ' ὅστις, echoes οὐδέν' in the previous line and heightens the pathos of Phil.'s situation. For the continuing description of Phil.'s feelings at being abandoned, cf. 691–9. The structural similarity between 280–2 ἄνδρα . . . οὐδέν' . . . , οὐχ ὅστις . . . , οὐδ' ὅστις . . . and 692–5 οὐδέ τι' . . . | παρ' ᾧ . . . | οὐδ' ὅς . . . is especially striking (Mauduit 1995: 345).

276 σὺ δὴ, τέκνον: δὴ has a connective force (*GP* 237) and also emphasizes σὺ, which together with τέκνον (cf. 236, 249, 260, 284, 300, 307, 315 ὦ παῖ) makes Phil.'s appeal to Ne. pointedly personal and helps to establish a virtual father-son relationship between them.

277 στήναι: the simple verb is used for the compound ἀναστήναι, cf. 48n.

279–80 ὁρῶντα μὲν . . . ἄνδρα δ': after ὁρῶντα μὲν ναῦς, a corresponding ὁρῶντα δ' ἄνδρα οὐδένα might have been expected; instead, the shift to ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' gives extra force to 'not a single man'. Cf. 308–11 ἐλεοῦσι μὲν . . . | . . . |

ἐκείνο δ' οὐδεις... , 919–20 σῶσαι κακοῦ μὲν πρῶτα τοῦδ'... ἔπειτα δὲ | ξὺν σοὶ... πορθῆσαι. In such antitheses, the lack of parallelism is a rhetorical means of calling attention to or emphasizing a word or words in the δέ clause.

ναῦς... ἐναυστόλουν: seven ships, cf. 1027, *Il.* 2.719. The cognate acc. is again rhetorically emphatic. ἔχων, expressing 'attendant circumstance' (Smyth §2068a), is virtually equivalent to 'with', cf. *Il.* 1.167–8 ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε | ἔρχομ' ἔχων, *Hdt.* 3.128.2 ἥϊε ἔχων ταῦτα, *Thuc.* 4.30 ἔχων στρατιάν ἀφικεῖται.

281–2 οὐδ'... συλλάβοιτο: a rare instance of the opt. in a rel. clause of purpose after ὀρῶντα, which has imperf. force; cf. 693–5 παρ' ὧ... ἀποκλαύσειεν. The fut. indic. is normal in this construction in Attic, e.g. *Aj.* 471–2 πείρα τις ζητητέα | τοιάδ' ἄφ' ἧς γέροντι δηλώσω πατρί, 1260–1 ἄλλον τιν' ἄξεις... | ὅστις πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀντί σου λέξει τὰ σά, *Tr.* 800, *OT* 412, 1437. Here the two optatives may have a kind of 'deliberative' force, implying the existence of an obstacle to carrying out a desired action (Smyth §2546); elsewhere, e.g. *Tr.* 903 κρύψας' ἑαυτήν ἔνθα μή τις εἰσίδοι ('having concealed herself where no one might see [her]'), no deliberative force is evident (*GMT*: §§572, 573, Smyth §§2554, 2705e, Moorhouse 275).

νόσου... συλλάβοιτο: συλλάβοιτο takes the (partitive) gen., like other verbs of touching and taking hold of, and its prefix συλ- (σύν) goes with the dat. κάμνοντι. Cf. *Eur. Med.* 946 συλλήψομαι δὲ τοῦδ' σοὶ κάγῳ πόνου.

282–3 πάντα... παρόν: δέ has the adversative force of ἀλλά (*GP* 165), balancing the participial clause in 279–82; cf. 971 οὐκ εἴ κακὸς σύ: πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἄνδρων... | ἔοικας ἡκιν, *Ani.* 84–5 ἀλλ' οὖν προμηνύσης γε τοῦτο μηδενί | τοῦργον, κρυφῇ δὲ κεῖθε. The pres. part. σκοπῶν and imperf. ἡύρισκον denote repeated, unending action: Phil. keeps looking but never finds anything on the island except his own anguish, to which he gives an objective existence by the absolute use of the inf. ἀνιᾶσθαι without the article, as if it were something external to himself, 'present beside' him (παρόν). Cf. 268n., *El.* 959–61 πάρεστί μὲν στένειν |... | πάρεστί δ' ἄλγειν.

284 τοῦτου: sc. τοῦ ἀνιᾶσθαι. **εὐμάρειαν:** the word originally means 'ease', then 'opportunity', 'abundance'. Cf. 704–5 εὐμαρεῖ... πόρου.

ὦ τέκνον: cf. 276 σύ, τέκνον. These two apostrophes frame the passage, concluding the first section of Phil.'s *rhēsis*, which, after much emotional turbulence, ends with quiet irony.

285–99 In the second section of his speech, Phil. turns from the story of his abandonment to an account of how he has survived. This story of his discovery or contrivance of ways to live on his own (286 μόνον) suggests the kind of primitive existence discussed by fifth-century sophists and natural philosophers interested in human social and cultural development (cf. Rose 1976: 57–64, Segal 1981: 292–315).

285 ὁ μὲν χρόνος... μοι 'so time after interval of time kept advancing for me'. διὰ χρόνου is 'after an interval of time', cf. 758 ἡκεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴ [*sc.* ἡ

νόσος] διὰ χρόνου, but χρόνος διὰ χρόνου suggests a succession of periods, while allowing simple διὰ χρόνου to resonate. Imperf. προῦβαινε conveys the continuing, unending advance of time (cf. Hdt. 3.53.1 τοῦ χρόνου προβαίνοντος), like other verbs in this part of Phil.'s speech. δὴ intensifies χρόνου, as it often does words signifying an indefinite quantity or number, and helps to produce an effective chiasmic alliteration: χρόνος δὴ διὰ χρόνου. Most recent editors prefer Wecklein's νυν, which would be inferential rather than temporal. Cf. 123–4n.

285–6 ὁ μὲν χρόνος . . . κἄδει τι . . . : ὁ μὲν χρόνος marks the beginning of the next main section of the speech, introducing the first part of a grammatically coordinated antithesis. The second limb, however, of this antithesis is introduced in 286 not by δέ but by καὶ in κἄδει, which expresses addition rather than contrast. Cf. 287–92 γαστρὶ μὲν . . . εἴ τ' ἔδει . . . , 1424–8 πρῶτον μὲν νόσου παύσῃ . . . , | ἀρετῇ τε πρῶτος ἐκκρίθεις . . . , | Πάριν μὲν . . . | . . . νοσφεῖς βίου, | πέρσεις τε Τροίαν, *Tr.* 689–91 ἔχρισα μὲν . . . | . . . | κἄθηκα . . . , 1012 πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πόντῳ, κατὰ τε δρία πάντα καθάιρων with Easterling's note; cf. *GP* 374–5n.2.

286 βαιῖ τῇδ' ὑπὸ στέγῃ 'under this humble roof'. Deictic τῇδ' implies a gesture of waving or pointing to the cave (cf. 288 τόξον τόδ'), and βαιῖ may mean literally as well as figuratively 'low to the ground' as well as 'small', 'paltry' (cf. 274 ῥάκη . . . βαιῖ). στέγῃ originally means 'roof' (cf. στέγω 'cover'); then a roofed, enclosed area – a 'room', 'chamber', or some other confined dwelling-space – that offers shelter (e.g. the cave at 298, Ajax's 'hut' at *Aj.* 108); then by extension (esp. in the pl.), a 'house'. Usually στέγῃ refers to a product of human construction, not to a cave or other natural shelter. Cf. 1262 with 1261–2n. μόνον agrees with με, understood from 285 μοι as subj. of διακονεῖσθαι. It is emphatic by its position at the end of the line, pathetically reiterating Phil.'s solitary existence (cf. 183, 227–8, 269).

287 διακονεῖσθαι 'to provide for myself', with ἐμαυτῷ understood. Cf. *Ar. Ach.* 1017 αὐτῷ διακονεῖσθαι, *Pl. Lg.* 763a5 διακονοῦντες (*sc.* τῇ πόλει) καὶ διακονούμενοι ἑαυτοῖς. γαστρὶ μὲν τὰ σύμφορα '(my) belly's needs' (cf. Σ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα) is picked up by 292 εἴ τ' ἔδει τι καὶ πότον λαβεῖν (cf. 285–6n.), as Phil. moves from food to water, then in 295 to fire.

288–9 τόξον . . . πελείας: the bow, personified as subj. of ἐξηύρισκε and the part. βάλλον, takes the place of a fellow human as Phil.'s companion. Without it the lame Phil. could not catch the winged doves and thus could not sustain life.

289–92 πρὸς δὲ τοῦθ' . . . πρὸς τοῦτ' ἄν 'toward this (thing), whatever my arrow drawn back with the bowstring might strike, I, poor wretch, would crawl, dragging my miserable foot toward this (thing)'. πρὸς (δὲ) τοῦτ' frames the past general relative conditional sentence, emphasizing the target toward which – and only as far as which (πρὸς) – Phil. would struggle; νευροσπαδῆς suggests the effort of drawing the bow and shooting the arrow. ἄν can be used with the imperf. or aor. indic. in an 'iterative' construction to indicate a customary or habitual action. This construction occurs in Hdt., is common in *Ar.* and Attic prose and may be colloquial (Stevens 1945: 103, 1976: 60). The only examples in tragedy are

Ph. 290–1, 294–5, 443, 701–2 and *Eur. Pho.* 401. Cf. Moorhouse 189; *GMT* §§162, 249, Smyth §§1790–1, 2341. **βάλλον . . . βάλοι:** the repetition at the end of the verse of the initial word (*epanadiplosis*) contributes to the sense of Phil.'s struggle to survive and gives an impression of the bow's independent agency (cf. Easterling 1973: 28). **ἄν . . . ἄν:** cf. 222–3n.

292–5 **εἰ τι . . . ἐμηχανώμην** 'and if it was necessary to get something to drink too, and – perchance frost having spread out, as (happens) in winter – to break up some wood, wretched(ly) crawling I would contrive this'. **καί** in 292 is adverbial, modifying **τι . . . ποτὸν**. **καί** in 293 is connective, marking as it were a separate task (**ξύλον τι . . . θραύσαι**) and separate stage (drink is needed all through the year, firewood only in winter), but both **λαβεῖν** and **θραύσαι** are dependent on 292 **εἴδει**. **που . . . χυθέντος:** **που** does not refer to place but, as often, conveys a sense of indeterminacy. **οἶα = ὥς**, cf. 273, *OT* 751 οἶ' ἀνὴρ ἀρχηγέτης. In Homer **χεῖσθαι** is used of snow falling (*Il.* 12.284), mist (*Od.* 7.143), and sleep (*Od.* 19.590).

294–7 **ταῦτ' ἄν . . . φῶς:** the vivid picture of Phil. struggling painfully to meet his own needs (287 **διακονεῖσθαι**) is conveyed by (1) the repeated use of the iterative imperfect with double **ἄν**; (2) 296 **ἐκτρίβων** echoing 291 **ἐξέλκων** and 294 **ἐξέρπων** at the same position in the line; (3) **αὐτός . . . τάλας** in agreement with the subj. of 291 **εἰλυόμεν** and 295 **ἐμηχανώμην**, each verb the first word in its line following enjambment; (4) the juxtaposed and alliterative 295 **εἴτα πυρ ἄν οὐ παρῆν** and 296 **ἄλλ' ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον**, and (5) the climactic 297 **ἔφην' ἄφαντον φῶς**, with the instantaneous aor., after three imperfects and two pres. participles, marking the moment of success, the spark of saving fire. For the change of metrical treatment of **ε** before plosive and liquid in **ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον**, cf. 827 "Υπν' . . . ὕπνε, *Ant.* 1240 **κείται δὲ νεκρὸς περὶ νεκρῷ**, *OC* 442 **οἱ τοῦ πατρὸς τῷ πατρί**, 883 **Χο. ἄρ' οὐχ ὕβρις τάδ'**; **Κρ. ὕβρις** (see Hopkinson 1982: 172). For the alliterative **ἔφην' ἄφαντον φῶς**, cf. *Ant.* 100–4 **τὸ κάλ- | λιστον ἐπταπύλῳ φανέν | Θήβαι τῶν προτέρων φάος**, | **ἐφάνθης ποτ'**, ὦ χρυσέας | ἀμέρας βλέφαρον, where the appearance of the sun symbolizes a salvation analogous to the literal salvation made possible by Phil.'s production of fire. **μόλις** is felt with both 296 **ἐκτρίβων** and 297 **ἔφην'**, cf. 403–4n.

297 **δ καὶ . . . ἀεὶ** 'which is just what saves me every time'. **καί** gives special emphasis to the whole relative clause. Fire plays the same salvational role for Phil. as Athena does for Od. in 134 **ἥ σώιζει μ' ἀεὶ**. Phil., however, by 'making visible the invisible fire', actually saves himself, while Odysseus requires the patronage of Athena for his success. The emphasis on fire as sustaining Phil.'s life calls to mind its key role in fifth- and fourth-century accounts of the development of human civilization, e.g. Aesch. *PV* 7–8 (Prometheus) **παντέχνον πυρὸς σέλας | θνητοῖσι κλέψας ὤπασεν**. Cf. Pl. *Prot.* 321d2–3, Xen. *Mem.* 4.3.7.

298–300 **οἰκουμένη . . . ἐμέ:** Phil. ends the account of his life on Lemnos with a description, both proud and ironically resigned, of how he has provided for himself. The limits of what he has been able to contrive (295 **ἐμηχανώμην**)

can be seen by comparison with the nearly unlimited μηχανόεν | τέχνας which is the engine of human δεινότης and progress at *Ant.* 363–4. In the latter passage, ἄνθρωπος is παντοπόρος· ἄπορος ἐπ’ οὐδὲν ἔρχεται | τὸ μέλλον (‘he has every resource: he goes to meet nothing that might occur without resource(s)’), *Ant.* 360–1), and νόσων ἀμηχάνων φυγὰς | ξυμπέφρασται (‘he has devised for himself escapes from (previously) baffling diseases’, *Ant.* 363–4). For Phil., by contrast, to inhabit a roofed dwelling with fire provides everything, ‘except that I not be sick’, and ‘everything’ turns out to be only 311–13 ἀπόλλυμαι τάλας | ἔτος τοδ’ ἤδη δέκατον ἐν λιμῶι τε καὶ | κακοῖσι βόσκων τὴν ἀδηφάγον νόσον. It is open to question whether Phil.’s account of his survival and life on Lemnos should be associated with fifth-century, sophistic theories of human progress like those in the ‘Ode to Man’ in *Ant.* (cf. 297.), or whether it rather shows the fragility (and futility) of such progress in the face of the equally sophistic, politically ruthless τέχνη of Od. and the community he represents. γὰρ οὖν: οὖν strengthens γὰρ (*GP* 446): ‘for actually an inhabited shelter . . .’. For στέγη, cf. 286n.

300–16 with the apostrophe ὦ τέκνον, Phil. moves to the third main section of his speech, a description of the island itself, which he ends by reiterating that the sons of Atreus and Od. have ‘done such things to me’ and wishing that the ‘gods would give them suffering in payment for mine’.

300 φέρ’ . . . μάθηις: this is the only instance in surviving Greek literature of the second pers. subjunct. after φέρε in a positive exhortation. The normal construction is φέρε with second pers. imper. (cf. 433) or first pers. subjunct. (cf. 1452 φέρε νῦν . . . καλέσω, *Ar. Vesp.* 1516 φέρε νῦν συγχωρήσωμεν). Cf. *GMT* §258, Moorhouse 223, K–G: 1.220 Anm. 2. This highly unusual syntax is a sign of Phil.’s. highly wrought emotional state, as are the *asyndeta* in 300 and 301. τὸ τῆς νήσου ‘the nature of the island’. The neuter article + gen., forming a noun-phrase, can give a special emphasis, sometimes of dislike or disrespect. Cf. 497 τὰ τῶν διακόνων, *SCG* II.267, Smyth §1299.

301–4 ταύτη . . . βροτῶν: although Phil. says that the island offers no opportunity for mercantile profit (οὐδ’ . . . | ἐξεμπολήσει κέρδος) or hospitality and no one approaches it voluntarily, Od. and Ne. have indeed come voluntarily and for profit of a different kind (cf. 111, 112 κέρδος), and Ne. exploits Phil.’s hospitality. This is perhaps a small instance of dramatic irony, where a character’s language evokes the audience’s knowledge of a situation about which the character himself is ignorant.

302–3 ὅποι . . . ξενώσεται ‘nor (any place) sailing to which he will sell at a profit or be hosted’. ξενώσεται is fut. mid. with pass. meaning, cf. 48 φυλάσσεται, and there is no classical instance of ξενωθήσεται. Many verbs, especially those with stems ending in vowels or liquid consonants, use the fut. mid. as a pass. in the classical period and develop a separate fut. pass. only in later Greek (Smyth §§802, 808). Other verbs use both fut. mid. and fut. pass. forms in a pass. sense: the mid. forms generally have a durative aspect, and the pass. forms tend to be aoristic. Cf. Smyth §§809, 1738, 1911. The fut. is more usual than the subjunct.

in relative clauses expressing purpose or deliberation regarding a purpose. Cf. Aesch. *Pr.* 86–7 αὐτὸν γὰρ σε δεῖ προμηθέως, | ὅτῳ τρόπῳι τῆσδ' ἐκκυλισθήσῃ τέχνης, Smyth §2550. κέρδος is virtually a cognate acc. with ἐξεμπολήσει.

304 οἱ πλοῖ... βροτῶν 'for those of mortals who are sensible, sailings are not made here', i.e. 'sensible mortals do not sail here'. In Greek the plur. of abstract substantives is often used 'distributively' to indicate the individual varieties, instances, or manifestations of the idea expressed by the abstract (cf. Smyth §1000; *SCG* 1.21–2, Moorhouse: 6), but in English the sing. is more common, e.g., 'There is no sailing here...'. Cf. *OC* 552 τὰς αἰματηρὰς ὁμμάτων διαφθοράς ('the bloody destruction of eyes'), Aesch. *Ag.* 404–5 λιποῦσα ἀστοῖσιν... ναυβάτας ὀπλισμούς ('leaving behind for the citizens... the arming of seamen'). For ἐνθάδε = δεῦρο, cf. *Od.* 15.492 ἀλώμενος ἐνθαδ' ἱκάνω.

305 τάχ' οὖν... ἔσχε 'so perhaps someone has put in against his will'. οὖν indicates, concessively, that the speaker is moving on to a new point (*GP.* 426); cf. English 'granted'. τάχα without ἄν usually means 'quickly', but cf. *Pl. Lg.* 711a6 ὑμεῖς δὲ τάχα οὐδὲ τεθέσθαε τυραννουμένην πόλιν. ἔσχε = προσέσχε, cf. 236, 48n.

305–6 πολλὰ... χρόνῳ 'for these things could happen many (times) in the long lifetime of human beings', i.e. in a long human lifetime; τάδε, as often, is used in the sense of τοιαῦτα. πολλὰ is pred. adj. virtually an adverb. ὁ μακρὸς χρόνος refers to the long span of an individual's life (or individuals' lives), not to the time in which human beings have existed; cf. *Ant.* 461–2 εἰ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου | πρόσθεν θανοῦμαι, *OC* 7–8 στέργειν γὰρ αἱ πάθαι με χῶ χρόνος ξυνών | μακρὸς διδάσκει, *Hdt.* 1.32.2 ἐν γὰρ τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ πολλὰ μὲν ἔστι ἰδεῖν... .

307 οὗτοι refers back to 305 τις: different men have come at different times. Cf. *Ant.* 709 οὗτοι referring to 707 ὅστις. The apostrophe once again is a sign of Phil.'s intense desire to communicate to Ne. his situation and feelings, cf. 276–82n.

307–8 λόγοις | ἔλεοῦσι μὲν is in antithesis to 310 ἐκείνο δ'. λόγοις is emphatic by its position at the end of the line and the beginning of its clause. For the resolved *anceps* at position 1 of the trimeter, cf. 94 with n., *Introd.*, p. 38.

308–9 καὶ πού... οἰκτίραντες 'and perhaps out of a momentary impulse of pity they give me in addition (to their pity) a portion of food or some clothing'. Phil. speaks with bitter scorn of the occasional visitors who, the word βορᾶς suggests, pitied him but treated him like a beast (cf. 274–5 βορᾶς | ἐπωφέλῃμα σμικρόν with 273–5n.). παρέδοσαν and οἰκτίραντες are gnomic aorists expressing a general truth or what happens typically (Smyth §1931, *GMT* §§14, 155, Moorhouse 196–7).

310–11 ἐκείνο... ἐς οἶκους: sc. ποιῆσαι, 'but that thing no one, when I mention (it), is willing (to do), to save me (by bringing me) home'; cf. 100 τί οὖν μ' ἄνωγας ἄλλο (ποιεῖν); *Ant.* 497 θέλεις τι μεῖζον (ποιεῖν). ἐκείνο anticipates 311 σῶσαι μ' ἐς οἶκους and implies that this is a remote possibility. Cf. Aesch. *Per.* 737 πρὸς ἡπείρον σεσῶσθαι. Contrast Phil.'s notion of 'salvation' with that of *Od.* (109, 134), cf. 294–7n.

311 ἀπόλλυμαι τάλας: τάλας is in apposition to the subj. of ἀπόλλυμαι. Cf. 923 ἀπόλωλα τλήμων, 956-7 αὐτὸς τάλας | θανών, 1126, *OC* 1583 δλωλε δύστανος. ἀπόλλυμι and ἄλλυμι recur when Phil. speaks of how he has been destroyed by his abandonment on Lemnos or how the sons of Atreus, Ne. or the Chorus have treated him (or will treat him). For ἀπόλλυμι, see 817, 923, 978, 1187, 1356; for ἄλλυμι, 685, 1105, 1172, 1388. Along with θνήσκω and related words at 624, 819, 946-7, 957, 1018, 1030, 1085, the recurrence of ἀπόλλυμι and ἄλλυμι suggests that Phil. is symbolically dead on Lemnos, even before his imminent physical death without his bow (cf. 931, 933, 1058, 1282-3). Cf. Segal 1981: 357-9, Mauduit 1995: 339-41.

312 ἔτος...δέκατον 'for this tenth year now' (acc. of duration of time), modifying both 311 ἀπόλλυμι and 313 βόσκων. Cf. 685 ὥλλυθ' ὧδ' ἀναξίως for a similar emphasis on the continuing quality of Phil.'s suffering.

312-13 ἐν...κακοῖσι 'in hunger and miseries'. For τε καὶ at the end of the trimeter, cf. *Ant.* 171, *OT* 267, 1234. Contrast 48, where τε ends the first colon of the line and καὶ begins the second, cf. 48n. For the instrumental dat. with ἐν, cf. 60 with n. βόσκων...νόσον: cf. 7 διαβόρω n., 745 βρύκομαι, 794-5 πῶς ἂν ἄντ' ἐμοῦ...τρέφειτε τήνδε τὴν νόσον, fr. 976 ἀδηφαγοῦσα, Avezzù 1988: 52. For the disease as an animal, cf. 697.

314-15 τοιαῦτ'...δέδρακας: for δράω with double acc., cf. 918, *OC* 853-4 αὐτὸν οὔτε νῦν καλὰ | δράις οὔτε πρόσθεν. τοιαῦτ' is internal obj., μ', external. Cf. Smyth §§1590, 1620, 1622. For the apostrophe, cf. 300n. ἦ τ' Ὀδυσσέως βία: cf. 321, 592, *Introd.*, p. 21. Throughout the play Od. speaks of using violence, e.g. 563, 945, 988 ἐκ βίας ἀγειν/ἀγεσθαι, 983 βία στελοῦσί σε, 1297 σ'...ἀποστελῶ βίαι. Cf. Kreon in *OC*, whose forceful kidnapping of Oidipous' daughters and attempt on Oidipous (e.g. 815, 845,) is considered by Theseus to be violence against himself (913) and Athens (916, 922).

315-16 οἷς...παθεῖν 'to whom, in their own persons (αὐτοῖς), may the Olympian gods some day grant to suffer payment in return for (what they have done to) me'. There is no need to read οἴ for οἷς under the influence of 275 (οἴ αὐτοῖς τύχοι). οἷς...αὐτοῖς makes a stronger statement of Phil.'s hatred of the Atreidai and Od., and 314 τοιαῦτα refers back to what Philoktetes has said, not forward to what follows.

317-42 After the two-line comment by the Koryphaios (317-18), typical after a long *rhēsis*, the exchange in trimeters between Ne. and Phil. begins with a symmetrical pattern unique in surviving Attic tragedy: three sequences each composed of three lines spoken by Ne., followed by two in the form of a question spoken by Phil. (319-21, 322-3; 324-6, 327-8; 329-31, 332-3). Then a not quite symmetrical sequence (Ne. 334-5, Phil. 336-8; Ne. 339-40, Phil. 341-2) leads into Ne.'s long narrative of his wrongs at the hands of the Atreidai and Od. (343-90).

317-18 ἔοικα...ἐποικτίρειν σε 'I seem (to myself) to pity you equally to (i.e. 'to the same degree to which') the strangers who have (previously) come (pitied you)'. ἔοικα with inf. = 'seem (to oneself)', 'think'. The personal use of the verb

(cf. 821) is relatively rare (LSJ s.v. II.1) and often implies ‘as is natural’; unlike the impersonal use, it never means ‘seem best’ or ‘seem advantageous’. ἴσα is adv. acc. of the internal obj. (Smyth §§1573, 1606–11, Moorhouse 41–2), modifying ἐποικίτιρην and governing τοῖς ἀφιγμένοις ξένοις. ἴσα and ἴσον are frequently used adverbially in both poetry and prose. The ι is always long in epic, usually long in archaic lyric and elegy, but always short in tragedy, except in the epic adj. ἰσόθεος (e.g. *Ant.* 837, *Aesch.* *Pers.* 80, 857) and in *Aesch.* *PV* 549 ἰσόνειρον.

319–20 ἐγὼ . . . οἶδα ‘and I myself too (am) a witness (who was present and can testify) to these words (of yours); I know that they are true’. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸς picks up 317 ἔοικα κἀγώ. μάρτυς and μαρτυρέω usually take the genitive of the thing being witnessed or the dative of the person for whom one is bearing witness, but ἐν + dat. effectively conveys Ne.’s claim to have been present as an eye-witness who can now testify to the truth of what Phil. has just said. ἐν also may suggest that Ne. supports Phil. in his virtual plea against the Atreidai and Od. Cf. *Aesch.* *Ch.* 987 ὥς ἂν (Ἥλιος) παρῇ μοι μάρτυς ἐν δίκῃ ποτέ.

320–1 σὺν τυγχάνω . . . βίας ‘having found the Atreidai and the violent Od. to be evil men’ (κακῶν | ἀνδρῶν is pred.). τυγχάνω and its compounds, like other verbs of ‘meeting with’, normally govern the gen., but συντυγχάνω normally takes the (comitative) dat. This would be the only instance of συντυγχάνω with the gen., though other compounds of τυγχάνω occasionally take the gen. where a dat. would be expected, e.g. 1333 ἐντυχών . . . Ἀσκληπιδῶν, 552 προστυχόντι τῶν ἴσων. Therefore Paley rightly proposed σὺν τυχών, with σὺν having adv. force. Cf. *Aj.* 1288 σὺν δ’ ἐγὼ παρών, *Ant.* 85 σὺν δ’ αὐτῶς ἐγώ, *Aesch.* *Ag.* 586 σὺν δὲ πλουτίζειν ἐμέ. If συντυχών were retained as a single word, the prefix would govern an implied σοι ‘along with you’, ‘like you’. τῆς τ’ . . . βίας; cf. 315–16n. Ne. strategically reiterates Phil.’s language in order to convince him that the two of them have a common experience and shared case against the same enemies.

322 ἦ γάρ: cf. 248n.

322–3 τοῖς πανώλεθροις . . . Ἀτρεΐδαις: cf. 1357 τῶι πανώλει παιδί τοῦ Λαερτίου, *Eur.* *El.* 86–7 χῆ πανώλεθρος | μήτηρ. ἔγκλημα ‘complaint’, ‘accusation’ is often used in a legal context, cf. 319 μάρτυς, 328 χόλον . . . ἐγκαλῶν. For the dat., cf. *Ar.* *Pax* 659 ὀργήν . . . αὐτοῖς . . . ἔχει, *Il.* 13.517 δὴ γάρ οἱ ἔχεν κότον.

323 ὥστε . . . παθών: ‘because you have suffered, with the result that you are angry’. παθών, agreeing with 322 σὺ, is emphatic by its position at the end of the sentence and the line. For θυμοῦσθαι used absolutely, cf. *Aesch.* *Ag.* 1069 οὐ θυμώσομαι, *Hdt.* 3.1.5 μεγάλως θυμωθέντα. Phil. believes that Ne. not only has heard and understood his (Phil.’s) suffering, but has suffered himself.

324 θυμὸν . . . πληρῶσαι ποτε ‘might it happen (for me) some day to satisfy my anger with my hand’, picking up 323 θυμοῦσθαι. Cf. *OC* 778 πλήρη δ’ ἔχοντι θυμόν, *Eur.* *Hipp.* 1328 πληροῦσα θυμόν. πληρῶσαι ποτε is, in effect, subj. of γένοιτο (cf. *OC* 607–8 οὐ γίγνεται | θεοῖσι γῆρας οὐδὲ κατθανεῖν ποτε)

(Moorhouse 241, Smyth §1985, *GMT* §745), but can also be understood as its complement (K-G II:12). The reading of the MSS, θυμῶι . . . χεῖρα 'may it be granted to my anger to satisfy my hand', is not idiomatic: the plural χεῖρες can be used figuratively for 'violence' or 'force', e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 260 ὑπόδικος . . . χερῶν, but there is no parallel for the singular.

325-6 **ἴν . . . ἔφν:** the wealthy home cities of Agamemnon and Menelaos are contrasted to the poor home island of Ne., cf. Eur. *Andr.* 209-10 ἡ Λάκαινα μὲν πόλις | μέγ' ἔστι, τὴν δὲ Σκυῖρον οὐδαμοῦ τίθης. 'Skyrian' was used proverbially of a worthless acquisition, e.g. Leutsch-Schneidewin II.148 Ἀρχὴ Σκυρία: ἐπὶ τῶν εὐτελῶν. πενιχρὰ γὰρ νῆσος ἡ Σκυρία; cf. LSJ *s.v.* Σκύριος. For the opt. in a purpose clause after an opt. in a wish, cf. *Aj.* 1216-22 γενοίμαν . . . | . . . ἄκραν | ὑπὸ πλάκα Σουνίου, | τὰς ἱερὰς ὅπως | προσείποιμεν Ἀθάνας, *Tr.* 955-7 ἦτις μ' ἀποικίσειεν ἐκ τόπων, ὅπως | . . . | μὴ . . . θάνοιμι . . . See *GMT* §181, Moorhouse 286, K-G II.383. For a similar attraction of the verb in a dependent clause into the opt., following an opt. in the main clause, see 528-9 with n. **χῆ Σκυῖρος** 'Skyros too' or, perhaps, 'my Skyros', cf. Eur. *Andr.* 210 (previous note), Moorhouse 147.

327 **εὖ γ'** 'bravo', a colloquialism used in replies confirming or approving something that has just been said, cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 213, *Eq.* 470, *Nub.* 866, Pl. *Gorg.* 494c. This is the only instance in tragedy without an expressed verb, e.g. Eur. *Or.* 386 εὖ γ' εἶπας. The colloquialism helps to convey Phil.'s emotion (Fraenkel 1977: 52, cf. 27-8). **γάρ** can be used both in a question where the speaker wishes to learn something that would explain the cause or origin of what another speaker has said (e.g. *Aj.* 282 τίς γάρ ποτ' ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ προσέπτατο, Aesch. *Ag.* 634 πῶς γὰρ λέγεις χειμῶνα . . . ἐλθεῖν) and in a question seeking information that is not explanatory (e.g. 161, 433, 651, 1405). Cf. *GP* 82.

327-8 **τίνος . . . ἐλήλυθας** 'on account of what have you come, making your great anger a (subject of) accusation against them in this way', i.e. 'accusing them of (having provoked) the great anger (which you show)'? ἐγκαλέω normally takes an acc. of the charge or accusation and a dat. of the person charged. Here, however, χόλον takes the place of the (omitted) reason for the χόλον as the obj. of ἐγκαλῶν, and κατ' αὐτῶν is more forceful than αὐτοῖς would be. τίνος is causal gen. dependent on ἐλήλυθας. For a similar looseness of expression, cf. *OT* 702 λέγ', εἰ σαφῶς τὸ νείκος ἐγκαλῶν ἐρεῖς 'say, if you will speak clearly making the strife a (subject of) accusation', i.e. 'accusing (someone of having provoked) the strife'.

329 **ἔξερῶ . . . ἐρῶ** 'I will tell the whole (ἐξ-) (story), but I will tell (it) with difficulty'. The force of ἐξ- (cf. 70-1n., *Introd.*, p. 32) carries over to the simple verb. Cf. *OT* 1075-6 ἀναρρήξει . . . ῥήγνυτο, *OC* 841 προβάθ' ὥδε βᾶτε βᾶτ', *Ichn.* fr. 314.201 εἴσιθ' ἴθι, and (with change of speaker) 1382-3 κατασχύνει . . . αἰσχύνειτ'; see Moorhouse 95. **μόλις δ'** for μόλις followed by μὲν in one clause and picked up by δέ or a similar word in the next, cf. *Ant.* 1105 μόλις μὲν, καρδίας δ' ἐξισταμαι . . ., Eur. *Pho.* 1363 μόλις μὲν, ἐξέτεινε δ', Ar.

Nub. 1363 μόλις μὲν, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς ἤνεσχύμην. In such constructions, the verb in the second clause also is understood with μόλις in the first. Here μόλις may have a double sense: Ne. claims that it is hard for him to tell fully how he was treated by Od. and the Atreidai, and also says (consciously or unconsciously) that it is hard for him, as the son of Achilles, to lie. Cf. Reinhardt 1979: 79, Schmidt 1973: 80. Actually, of course, Ne. lies with great fluency, however much the audience or reader might feel that it ought to be hard for him to do so.

330 ἀγῶγ' . . . ἐξελωβήθην 'I will tell in just what respect' (i.e. 'precisely how') I was utterly disgraced', cf. *GP* 122–3. ἀγῶγ' is *crasis* of ἄ and ἔγῶγ', in which ἄ is adv. acc. of respect (internal acc.) with ἐξελωβήθην 'I was utterly ridiculed and disgraced', an epic touch (like many in the speech of Ne.). In Homer λώβη, λωβάομαι, etc. denote a kind of outrage or disgrace that no hero would wish to suffer. This is the only occurrence of ἐκλωβάομαι in extant Greek literature. γέ is often attached to pronouns in dramatic dialogue; here, with rel. ὅ, it is both limitative and intensifying; cf. *GP* 122–3

331 ἐπεὶ . . . θανεῖν 'When fate had taken hold of ('constrained') Achilles to die'. ἔσχε is 'ingressive' (or 'inceptive') aor., expressing the beginning of an action (often one that causes a change of state in the subj. or obj. of the verb). Cf. 360, 367, 374, Smyth §1924, Moorhouse 194. θανεῖν expresses the result of ἔσχε (= ὥστε θανεῖν). Cf. Eur. *Hec.* 4–5 ἐπεὶ πόλιν | κίνδυνος ἔσχε δορί πεισεῖν. Ne. begins to tell his story as if beginning a messenger speech, but is cut off by Phil. and resumes the story only in 343. γάρ is explanatory: Ne.'s story will confirm and clarify the meaning of 330 ἐξελωβήθην.

332 φράσης μοι μὴ πέρα: for postponed, emphatic μὴ, cf. 66–7n. πρὶν ἂν μάθω: πρὶν takes the subjunct. with ἂν in the protasis of a fut. more vivid or pres. gen. condition, in which the apodosis, or main clause, is *negative* (here φράσης μοι μὴ); cf. 1332, 1409, *Tr.* 2–3 ὡς οὐκ ἂν αἰῶν' ἐκμάθοις βροτῶν, πρὶν ἂν | θάνῃ τις. Sometimes ἂν is omitted, e.g. 917 (cf. 764 ἕως ἀνῆι), *Aj.* 964–5 τὰ γὰρ ἔν χερσὶν | ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασι πρὶν τις ἐκβάλλῃ, *GMT* §§8645–50.

333 ἦ . . . γόνος: Phil.'s question does not indicate disbelief or doubt that Achilles is dead, but rather shock. He cannot immediately assimilate or make sense of Ne.'s report (cf. Reinhardt 1979: 266n.4). Cf. 414, *OT* 943 ἦ τέθηκε Πόλυβος . . . ;

334–5 τέθηκεν . . . δαμείς: δ' has nearly the force of ἀλλά, as often after a negative clause (ἀνδρὸς οὐδενός), cf. *GP* 167–8. ὕπο goes with both ἀνδρὸς οὐδενός and θεοῦ, and perhaps suggests, by its position in the sentence, that the arrow was shot by Apollo himself. At *Il.* 22.359–61 Hektor prophesies that Achilles will die at the hands of Apollo and Paris; at 21.416–17 the horse Xanthos, mentions 'a god and a man', and in the *Aithiopis* Achilles is killed by Paris and Apollo (*Argumentum* in Bernabé: 69, West 2003: 112–13). It is usually assumed that Paris shot and Apollo guided the fatal arrow, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.56–8). At *Il.* 21.278, however, Thetis says that Achilles will perish 'by the swift shafts of Apollo', without mentioning Paris; cf. Aesch. fr. 350.8–9 αὐτός [*sc.* Apollo] ἐστὶν ὁ κτανὼν |

τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἑμόν, *Hor. Carm.* 4.6.1-8, *Quint. Smyrn.* 3.60-2. In *Hyg. Fab.* 107.1 Apollo takes the form of Paris and kills Achilles with an arrow. λέγουσιν does not express doubt and indicates only that Ne. was not at Troy when Achilles was killed. The subj. of a third-pers. plur. verb of saying or thinking is often omitted.

336 ἀλλ'... μέν: ἀλλ' expresses a sympathetic reaction to Ne.'s news, cf. 557, 882, *GP* 19. μέν emphasizes εὐγενής (*GP* 361) and is not correlative with 337 δέ. ὁ κτανών τε... θανών: cf. *Ant.* 1263-4 ὦ κτανόντας τε καὶ θανόντας | βλέποντες. For the sentiment, cf. *Il.* 21.280 τῶι κ' ἀγαθὸς μὲν ἔπεφν', ἀγαθὸν δέ κεν ἔξενάριξεν. Apollo (ὁ κτανών) is εὐγενής in the sense that he is of noble lineage as the son of Zeus; the word has no moral connotation when used of a god, especially in this play.

337-8 τὸ... πάθῃμ: for enjambment, with the article and possess. adj. at the end of one line agreeing with a noun at the beginning of the next, cf. 14-15n. On -μα nouns, see 234n., 265-7n. ἐλέγχω... στένω: delib. subj. after ἀμυχανῶ.

339 οἶμαι μέν: μέν can be used to emphasize verbs denoting opinion, probability, or appearance as opposed to reality or certainty; cf. *OT* 1051 οἶμαι μὲν οὐδέν' ἄλλον ἢ τὸν ἐξ ἀγρῶν, *El.* 61 δοκῶ μέν, οὐδέν' ῥῆμα σὺν κέρδει κακόν, *OC* 995 δοκῶ μέν, εἴπερ ζῆν φιλεῖς... , *GP* 382. The emphasis is usually more on the verb than on the person speaking, but here there is a contrast between 'I think' and 'you for whom even (καὶ) your sorrows are sufficient'. τὰ σ': sc. ἀλγήματα. For elision of the accented second-pers. possess. adj., cf. *OT* 329 μὴ τὰ σ' ἐκφῆνω κακά, 404 τὰ σ' Οἰδίπου, *El.* 1499 τὰ γοῦν σ' ἐγώ σοι; for elision of accented σέ, cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 323 οὐ γὰρ ἐς σ' ἀμαρτάνω.

340 τῶν πέλας 'of others' (not necessarily neighbours); cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 441 τῶν πέλας with Barrett's note, *Thuc.* 1.32.1 παρὰ τοὺς πέλας.

341-2 ὀρθῶς... σ' ἐνύβρισαν 'you spoke truly; therefore, (go) back and tell me your affair again, in whatever respect they did you demeaning violence'. τοιγαροῦν emphasizes the logical connection between what follows (τὸ σὸν φράσον... πράγμ) and what preceded (ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας); cf. *GP* 566-7. αὐθις πάλιν 'back again', is an epicism, cf. *Il.* 5.257, 17.533, 23.229, *Od.* 14.356, 15.431. Ph. refers to 331, before Ne. interrupted him. πράγμ' is made emphatic by separation from 341 τὸ σὸν and placement at position 6 before a strong sense-break that virtually bisects the line. δῶτι σ' ἐνύβρισαν: δῶτι defines but does not refer grammatically to 341-2 τὸ σὸν | ... πράγμ', and ἐνύβρισαν is a specific reference to 330 ἐξελωβήθην. Cf. 396-7 ὅτ' ἐς τόνδ' Ἀτρεΐδαν | ὕβρις πᾶς ἔχῳρει, 1364 οἶδε σου καθύβρισαν. ἐν- in ἐνύβρισαν has the same force ('at', 'against') as it does in, e.g., ἐγγεῖλν, ἐγκαλεῖν. Cf. *Eur. El.* 68 ἐν τοῖς ἑμοῖς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνύβρισας κακοῖς.

343-90 In a long *rhesis* aimed at arousing sympathy, Ne. presents himself as having been betrayed by Od. and the Atreidai in a manner similar to the way in which they betrayed Phil. (cf. Hamilton 1975: 132-3; Hoppin 1981: 20).

Ne.'s speech has four parts: (1) 343-53 describe how Od. and Phoinix successfully recruited him for the war effort, after Achilles' death; (2) 354-62 tell how he came to Troy, was welcomed by the army, saw his father's corpse, and asked the Atreidai for his arms; (3) 363-81 describe their harsh refusal to give him the arms, now the possession of Od., who abusively maintains that he deserves them; (4) 382-90 explain that Ne. is now sailing back home from Troy and blame the Atreidai and Od. for mistreating him. Ne.'s speech is filled with epic diction, which distinguishes his (traditional) heroism from the unheroic (recognizably 'modern') opportunism of Od. While certain details in the speech conform to mythology with which Soph.'s audience (and modern readers) are likely to be familiar, other details differ from conventional versions of the story. Because Ne. is lying in accordance with Od.'s instructions to deceive Phil. (54-65), there is no way to know which details of his speech are to be taken as 'true' and which 'false'. Cf. Reinhardt 1979, 171-2; Pucci 200-2. The mention of Phoinix as Od.'s companion helps to make the embassy to Ne. analogous to the embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9.

343 ἤλθόν με . . . μέτα: Ne. picks up from 331 in mid-sentence, but 343-7 are also felt as a new sentence, beginning with a striking asyndeton in direct response to 340-1. με is obj. of μέτα (anastrophe, cf. 6n). νηὶ ποικιλοστόλῳ 'in an intricately adorned ship' (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.62 εὐανθέα δ' ἀναβάσομαι στόλον), or possibly 'in a ship with an intricately adorned prow' (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 408, where στόλος is used figuratively for ἔμβολον, the bronze 'ram' just below the prow). ποικιλοστόλῳ signifies more than the Homeric μιλτοπάρηις: there is a parallel between the ship's 'intricate adornment', meant to appeal to Ne., and the intricate story which is meant to deceive Phil. For the association of ποικίλλω, ποικίλος and their cognates with deception and devious (sometimes unmanly) cunning, see 130-11.

344 δῖός τ' Ὀδυσσεύς: the formula δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς occurs sixty times in the *Il.* and *Od.*, and πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς an additional thirty-eight times. Here the combination contributes to the distinctively epic tone and style of Ne.'s *rhēsis*.
χῶ . . . πατρός: Phoinix, cf. *Il.* 9.485-91.

345 εἴτ' ἄληθές . . . μάτην 'whether truly or, after all (οὖν), falsely'. For οὖν with the second εἴτε - less common than οὖν with the first - see *GP* 419, Smyth §2853. Cf. *OT* 90 οὔτε . . . οὔτ' οὖν, 271 μήτ' . . . μήτ' οὖν.

346 ὥς γίγνοιτ': opt. in indirect discourse after λέγοντες, which has the force of an impf. The direct statement would be, οὐ θέμις γίγνεται 'it becomes unlawful' (given that Achilles is dead, and in light of Helenos' prophecy).

347 τὰ πέργαμ': sc. Τροίης, cf. 353, 611, 1334, Eur. *Trö.* 556 Περγάμων ἔδρας. In the *Il.*, the acropolis of Troy is ἡ Πέργαμος (4.508, 5.460, 546, 6.512, 7.21, 24.700), while Hdt. 7.43 refers to τὸ Πριάμου Πέργαμον. At Aesch. *PV* 956, Eur. *Pho.* 1078, 1176, πέργαμα (cognate with πύργος) refers to citadels generally and is not a proper name. Ne. does not, of course, refer to Phil. or his bow as needed for the conquest of Troy, despite 68-9, 115, 196-200, and

makes no mention of Helenos' prophecy, with which he is apparently familiar at 1337-42.

348-9 οὐ . . . ταχύ 'not for long did they make me delay, with the result that I not set sail quickly', i.e. they didn't keep me long from setting sail quickly. The repetition of με and indirectness of expression strikingly convey Ne.'s (pretended) bitterness at having rushed off to Troy, only to be robbed of his arms and rejected as soon as he arrived; cf. Campbell, *Essay* 79, §42α. μή οὐ would be normal after the negative verb of hindering (Smyth §2742, *GMT* §809, Moorhouse 328-30), but μή alone is also found, e.g. at *Aj.* 96 κούδ' ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μή, *OT* 1387-8 οὐκ ἂν ἐσχόμην | τὸ μή ἀποκλῆσαι τοῦμόν ἄθλιον δέμας. ναυστολεῖν is used at 245, 279 of the initial expedition to Troy.

350-1 μάλιστα . . . ἄθαπτον: μάλιστα μέν . . . ἰμέρωι, explaining Ne.'s promptness in sailing, is picked up by 352 ἔπειτα μέντοι . . . δὴ strengthens μέν, as often in affirmations (cf. *GP* 258). ὅπως ἴδοιμ' ἄθαπτον is a pathetic touch which further accounts for Ne.'s haste.

352-3 ἔπειτα . . . ἰών 'then too, their reasoning and what they said (λόγος) was attractive (καλός), if after I came I should take the citadel atop Troy'. εἰ with the fut. opt. αἰρήσοιμ' implies a statement or thought introducing (virtual) indirect discourse in place of a direct statement, e.g. 'when I thought that' or 'at the idea of'; i.e. 'their reasoning was attractive not only because I thought that I would see my father's corpse, but in addition (προσῆν), when I thought I would take the citadel'. εἰ with the fut. indic. may have a similar implication; cf. 988 εἰ μ' οὗτος ἐκ τῶν σῶν ἀπάξεται βίαι (when I think that) this man will carry me off from your (precincts)'. Cf. *GMT* §235, Smyth §2622a, Campbell, *Essay* 46, §28.1

354 ἦν . . . πλέοντί μοι 'and for me sailing it was already the second day'. The dat. of a participle denoting a person observing or evaluating is here, as often, used to indicate a relation of time. Cf. *Tr.* 756-7 μέλλοντι δ' αὐτῶι . . . τεύχειν σφαγῶς | κῆρυξ . . . ἵκετ', *OT* 735 τίς χρόνος τοῖσδ' ἐστὶν οὐξεληλυθώς; This construction is common with verbs of coming or going, viewing and considering. Cf. Smyth §§1495-8, Moorhouse 84.

355-6 κἀγώ . . . κατηγόμεν: καί is used instead of a subordinating conjunction, e.g. ἐπεὶ, ὅτε, to indicate more vividly the temporal relation between two clauses, i.e. the time at which (or circumstances in which) the second clause takes place. Here this temporal parataxis vividly suggests the sudden appearance of 'hateful Sigeion' to Ne., as he arrived after a long voyage: 'it was the second day and (behold!) I was putting in . . .'. Ne. calls Sigeion, a cape in the northwest Troad, 'hateful' (cf. 254-6n), because of Achilles' death and his own sufferings there, but Soph.'s audience also would have understood πικρόν as referring to the tradition that Sigeion was the site of Achilles' tomb. Cf. Σ πικρόν διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ τεθῆσθαι τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, Cicero, *Arch.* 24, Lucian, *Charon* 23. For the acc. expressing the end of motion instead of the usual εἰς + acc., cf. 1175 with 1174-5n., 1332, *Aj.* 1341 Τροίαν ἀφικόμεσθα, *OC* 643 δόμους στείχειν ἐμούς. Such

'terminal' accusatives are common in lyric and tragedy but otherwise rare, cf. Bers 1984: 62–80. οὐρίῳ πλάτῃ 'with an oar favoured by a fair wind', i.e. 'sped by wind and oar' (Jebb). πλάτῃ is often used by synecdoche for 'ship', e.g. 220, Eur. *IT* 241–2 κυανέας Συμπληγάδας | πλάτῃ φυγόντες, *Hel.* 192. It is poetically irrelevant that a real ship would have been 'sped by' wind when at sea and by oar only when putting in to shore. κατηγομήνι: κατὰγεσθαι is regularly used of ships or sailors coming to land, and ἀνάγεσθαι for putting out to sea. Similarly, on land one goes 'down' to the coast and 'up' when travelling inland (cf. ἀνάβασις).

356–8 καί μ' . . . πάλιν 'and immediately (around me) in a circle the whole army was greeting me, when I had disembarked, swearing that they saw Achilles who was no longer (living) alive again'. Plural ὁμύντες vividly and emphatically 'agrees' with the singular collective στρατός . . . πᾶς in a 'sense construction'. Cf. *Ant.* 1021–2 ὄρνις . . . βεβρωῶτες, which is bolder because ὄρνις, unlike στρατός, does not have a collective sense; see *Il.* 17.755–6 ψαρῶν νέφος . . . ἡ κολοίων | . . . κεκλήγοντες with Edwards' note. The eagerness of the army to greet Ne., corresponding to his own eagerness (cf. 349 ταχύ), is conveyed not only by ἐνθῦς, but by the position of καί at position 5, looking forward rhetorically across the normal metrical boundary. For a similar tension between rhetorical and metrical form, cf. 125.

τόν . . . πάλιν: 'the perfect chiasmus represents vividly the contrast between the dead and the living Achilles, but the assonance between the two words ὄντα ζῶντ' seems to strengthen phonetically the notion that the dead Achilles is again alive' (Pucci 203). τόν, like the article in epic, has the force of a demonstrative: 'that (famous hero) Achilles'. ζῶντ' . . . πάλιν 'alive again', cf. *TrGF* 2, fr. *adespot.* 363 οὐ παῖς Ἀχιλλέως, ἀλλ' ἐκείνος αὐτὸς εἶ, a line some scholars have attributed to Soph.'s *Philoktetes in Troy* or *Skyrioi*. Philostratos, *Imag.* 394.7–8 Kayser says that when Phoinix went to Skyros to bring Ne. to Troy, Ne.'s 'graceful and well-built form' (τὸ ἄβρόν τε καὶ τὸ ἄδρὸν τοῦ εἶδους) suggested that he was the son of Achilles. Cf. Livy 21.4.2 on Hannibal: *Hamilcarem iuvenem redditum sibi veteres milites credere*.

359 ἔκειτ' 'lay dead', an epicism, e.g. *Il.* 13.414, 18.20. Cf. *El.* 1134 θανὼν ἐκείσο, *Ant.* 1174 τίς δ' ὁ κείμενος. ἔκειτ' gains force from its placement at position 6, with no word-end at 5 or 7 (quasi-middle caesura). The implication is that Ne. arrived at Troy before Achilles was buried, though he is not mentioned in the description of the lamentation and burial of Achilles at *Od.* 24.58–92. ἔκειτ' also could mean simply 'he was dead', not that the corpse actually 'lay dead', ready to be buried.

360 ἐπεὶ . . . κείνον 'when I had wept for him'. Contrast 367 where ῥαδὰκρύσας has ingressive force (cf. 331n.). For prodelision of the temporal augment, cf. 369, *Ant.* 457, *Tr.* 560, *OC* 974, 1602. οὐ μακρῷ χρόνῳ 'in (i.e. 'after') a not long time', i.e. 'before long', in relation to 361 ἐλθόν. Cf. 598–600n., *El.* 1273–4 ἰὼ χρόνῳ μακρῷ . . . | . . . ἐπαξιώσας ὥδ' ἐμοὶ φανῆναι, *OC* 1648 χρόνῳ βραχεῖ στραφέντες.

361–2 ἐλθὼν . . . ἦν ‘having gone to the Atreidai, I asked in a friendly way, as was reasonable, to have my father’s arms returned and the other things, as many as were (his)’. προσφιλῶς, the reading of several MSS, is preferable to πρὸς φίλους, the reading of most. With πρὸς φίλους the sense would be, ‘Having gone to the Atreidai – to friends, as was reasonable (to suppose) – I sought . . .’, but it is perhaps less natural for Ne. to say that it was reasonable (to suppose or expect) that the Atreidai (would be) friends than that he went to them in a friendly way. Also, to take ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν with ἐλθὼν rather than πρὸς φίλους would go against the word-order. Since ἀπαιτέω usually means ‘demand to have returned’, Ne. might seem to describe himself as already wanting back something that he could not yet have known had been taken from him; he would, however, have known that someone had (temporary) keeping of the arms. τὰ θ’ . . . ἦν: 362 consists, remarkably, of nine words (not counting enclitics) with five elisions; the repeated τ and π and the ο, α, and ου sounds express phonetically Ne.’s frustration and anger at not having received what he demanded. Cf. 379 with n.

363 οἱ δ’ εἴπον: the definite article is used as a substantival pron., another epicism; cf. 371 ὁ δ’ εἴπ’ Ὀδυσσεύς. As often, δ(ε) indicates a change of speaker. Though Ne. refers in the plur. to the Atreidai, presumably Agamemnon alone actually spoke. Cf. 369n.

οἱμοι, τλημονέστατον λογον: Ne. seems both emotionally and morally indignant (τλημονέστατον virtually = ἀναιδέστατον), as he follows Od.’s command to deceive Phil.

364–5 τὰλλα . . . ἐλέσθαι ‘the other things are yours to take as belonging to your father’: πατρῷ is pred. and ἐλέσθαι an expegetic inf. after πάρεστί σοι.

366 κρατύνει νῦν ‘is master of them now’, with the double connotation of having physical possession of the weapons and of having the strength to wield them (cf. κραταιός as an epithet for hands or arms, e.g. 1110, Eur. *Her.* 964 θιγὼν κραταιῶς χειρός, *TrGF* 2, fr. *adespot.* 416.1 κραταιῶι περιβαλὼν βραχίονι). κρατύνει with the gen. (cf. κρατέω) suggests that Od. possesses the armour as their master. When κρατύνω takes the acc., it may imply actual use rather than mere possession, cf. 1059, Pind. *Olymp.* 13.95 καρτύνειν βέλεα χεροῖν, Ap. Rhod. 2.332 καρτύναντες ἑαῖς ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἔρετμά.

367 ἔδακρύσας . . . ἐξανίσταμαι ‘bursting into tears I rise from my seat’; the ingressive aor. part. (cf. 331n.) is followed by a shift to the more vivid pres., as Ne. excitedly tells how he ‘stood up’ to the sons of Atreus. The passive forms of ἵστημι and its compounds are intransitive, as are the second aor., perf., and pluperf. active. ἔδακρύσας is found in only one MS and the verb occurs elsewhere only in Eur. *Pho.* 1344 ὥστ’ ἐδακρῦσαί γ’, Demades fr. 89 (de Falco), and imperial prose. δακρύσας, the less vivid reading of all the other MSS, may be correct, but ἐκ- . . . ἐκ- . . . is rhetorically effective and in character for Ne. There is nothing shameful or unmanly about a Greek hero weeping at moments of heightened emotion. Cf. *Il.* 1.349, 357, 9.433, 16.11, 18.17; Monsacré 1984: 137–42; T. E. Page on *Aen.* 1.459.

368 ὀργῇ βαρεῖται: Ne. is his father's son. Cf. *OC* 1330 μῆνιν βαρεῖαν, Chadwick 69. καταλήσας: κατ- intensifies the force of the verb, which occurs only here in extant Greek literature.

369 ὦ σφέτλι'... τολήσας: the shift from sing. σφέτλι(ε) to the plur. τολήσας(ε) suggests that these contemptuous words are meant not only for Agamemnon, but also for Menelaos and perhaps the other Greek leaders. For τολήσας, cf. 363n.

370 τάμ'... ἐμοῦ: the double possessive (adj. and pron.) is emphatic. πρὶν μαθεῖν ἐμοῦ 'before you had asked and learned from me (that you might give them)'. Normally μανθάνω with gen., used of a person, means 'understand', but here the construction and sense are like those of πυνθάνομαι. πρὶν + inf. is usual after an affirmative clause, but after a negative clause, πρὶν + indic. normally refers to a definite time, and πρὶν + subj. or opt. to an indefinite time. Cf. Smyth §§2431–2, 2453–5.

371 ὁ δ' εἶπ' Ὀδυσσεύς: see 363n. κύρει: unaugmented forms of the impf. and aor. are rare in tragedy, outside lyrics and messenger speeches, but Ne.'s *rhēsis* is virtually a messenger speech. Cf. 331n. Many editors favour κυρεῖ, and the pres. might seem appropriate after the vivid pres. in 367 and 368, but explanatory γάρ 'does not combine with the historic present' in the same sentence (Rijksbaron 2006: 140).

372 ναί... τάδε: the sharpness of Od.'s reply is marked by the assonance in ναί, παῖ and the fourfold alliteration of δ.

373 παρών 'being present (in the right place at the right time)', with the implication 'unlike you' (cf. 379). Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1242 σώσαι παρών. Od. does not mention Telamonian Ajax, together with whom, in most versions of the story, he rescued Achilles' corpse and arms. See, e.g., *Aithiopsis, Argumentum* (Bernabé 112 = West 2003: 112–13) Αἴας ἀνελόμενος [*sc.* τὸ σῶμα] ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς κομίζει, Ὀδυσσεύς ἀπομαχομένου τοῖς Τρωσίν. Od. similarly claims all the credit at Ovid *Met.* 13.284–5: *his umeris, his, inquam, umeris ego corpus Achillis | et simul arma tuli* ('on these shoulders, these shoulders, I say, I carried (off) Achilles' body and at the same time his arms').

374 χολωθείς: ingressive aor., cf. 334n.

374–5 ἥρασσον... πᾶσιν 'I kept on striking (him) with all manner of (accusations of) evils', cf. *Aj.* 724–5 ὀνειδέσιν|ἥρασσον. The word is used elsewhere in tragedy of extreme and violent actions, e.g. *OT* 1276 ἥρασσ' ἐπαίρων βλέφαρα, *Ant.* 974–6 ὀμμάτων... | ἀραχθέντων ὑφ' αἱματηραῖς | χεῖρεςσι καὶ κερκίδων ἀκμοῖσιν 'eyes struck by bloody hands and shuttle points'. For τοῖς πᾶσι 'all manner of', cf. *Tr.* 716 φθείρει τὰ πάντα κνώδαλ'.

375 οὐδὲν... ποιοῦμενος lit. 'making (for my part) nothing lacking', i.e. 'leaving out nothing (that occurred to me)'. Cf. Eur. *Pho.* 385 μὴδὲν ἐνδεὲς λίπῃς. For the middle, cf. *OC* 1143–4 τὸν βίον σπουδάζομεν | λαμπρὸν ποιεῖσθαι ('we are eager, for our part, to make life splendid').

376 εἰ . . . ἀφαιρήσοιτό με ‘if (i.e. ‘at the thought that’) that man would take my arms from me for himself’, cf. 352–3n. Ne.’s direct statement would have been, εἰ ἀφαιρήσεται. The double acc. with ἀφαιροῦμαι, rather than the gen. or dat. of the person and acc. of the thing taken away, is common in Attic drama, e.g. Eur. *Andr.* 613 πολιοῦς τ’ ἀφείλου πατέρας εὐγενῆ τέκνα, Ar. *Ach.* 464 ἀφαιρήσει με τὴν τραγωιδίαν. The combination of first pers. adj. τάμά and pron. (ἐμοῦ / με) in the final lines of successive sentences (370, 376) nicely suggests Ne.’s (supposedly) wounded ego.

377–8 ὁ δ’ . . . ἡμείψατο ‘and that man, coming (in) here (i.e. ‘intervening at this point’), although he does not have a bad temper, | stung with regard to what he heard, responded thus to us’. Once again, the subst. article, ὁ, followed by δ(έ) marking the change of speaker (cf. 363, 371), and ἡμείψατο are in epic style. πρὸς ἀξήκουσεν (*crasis* of ἀ ἐξήκουσεν) goes with both δηχθεῖς and ὦδ’ ἡμείψατο, cf. 404 πρὸς ἡμᾶς with 403–4n. πρὸς ‘in regard to’ is common after expressions of emotion, cf. 1307, *Tr.* 1211 ἄλλ’ εἰ φοβῆι πρὸς τοῦτο, LSJ *s.v.* c.iii.2. δάκνω (like κνίζω, LSJ *s.v.* 2) can be used metaphorically of feelings aroused by words, e.g. *Tr.* 254 ἐδήχθη . . . τοῦνειδος λαβών, *Ant.* 317 ἐν τοῖσιν ὧσιν ἦ ’πὶ τῇ ψυχῇ δάκνη. δύσοργος is found elsewhere only in *Aj.* 1017 ἀνὴρ δύσοργος, *Tr.* 1117–18 μὴ τοσοῦτον ὥς δάκνη | θυμῷ δύσοργος ‘not (being) wrathful to such an extent as you are (now) stung in your spirit’, i.e. ‘calming your anger’ (tr. Easterling). As Ne. tells the story, Od. was provoked by his insults and youthful defiance; δύσοργος used of Od. is almost metaliterary, as if Ne. had read and is contradicting the *Od.*, where Od. famously can endure almost anything; cf. *Od.* 20.18 τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ’ ἔτλης. Cf. 443–4n. ἐνθάδ’ ἤκων: for ἐνθάδε used of circumstances, cf. 899 ἐνθάδ’ . . . τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους ‘here (i.e. ‘at this point’) in this suffering of mine’.

379–81 Od. treats Ne. with contempt, chastising him for his arrogant language as if he were an irresponsible child.

379 οὐκ . . . ἔδει ‘you were not where we (were), but you were away from where you needed (to be)’, i.e. in the battle over the fallen Achilles – another nine-word line (not counting σ’), with six elisions, cf. 362, 626.

380–1 καὶ ταῦτ’ . . . ἔχων ‘and since (in addition to not having been present) you actually speak in this way, mouthing off arrogantly, you will never sail away to that Skyros of yours, having these (arms)’. ταῦτ’ is first felt as an adv. acc. of manner with λέγεις (Smyth §1608), then turns out to be dir. obj. of ἔχων. On this kind of double construction, see Campbell, *Essay* 66–7, §36.B.7.1. ἐπειδὴ καὶ λέγεις: in causal clauses responding to something that has just been said

or to a preceding context, καὶ may follow ἐπεὶ, ἐπειδὴ, or ὅτε and mark an addition either to the content of the sentence’s main clause or, as here, to ‘a general, unexpressed concept’ (*GP* 296–7). This additive use of καὶ is close to adverbial ‘even’, ‘actually’.

τὴν Σκύρον: the def. article is condescending and scornful, cf. 326n. οὐ μὴ: cf. 103 with n., 418.

382–4 Ne. begins the final section of his speech with a striking chiasmus, then returns to his main theme – that he is sailing home, robbed of his arms by Od.

382 τοιαῦτ'...κακά 'having heard such vile things said about me and having been abused in such a vile way'. κακά is dir. obj. of ἀκούσας and internal 'cognate' acc. with ἐξονειδισθεῖς. Cf. 330, 607, *El.* 288 τοιάδ' ἐξονειδίζει κακά.

383–4 πλέω...Ὀδυσσέως is made more forceful by conspicuous alliteration of π, τ, and esp. κ and by triple assonance of α in 384. πρὸς οἴκους 'to (my) home country', cf. 60. The sing. would suggest to my (individual) home (e.g. 58, 240, 488, 548).

τητῶμενος: τητάω is found only in the pres. pass., almost always with the gen. It denotes a state of deprivation, bereavement, or want, never the act of depriving, etc. Cf. *El.* 265 λαβεῖν θ' ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ τητᾶσθαι πέλει, 1326 καὶ φρενῶν τητῶμενοι, *OC* 1200 τῶν σῶν ἀδέρκτων ὁμμάτων τητῶμενος.

κακίστου κακ κακῶν: cf. 874 with 876n., Eur. *Andr.* 590 κακίστου κακ κακῶν with Stevens' note. Here the ref. is to Od. supposedly being the son of the arch-criminal Sisyphos, cf. 417n. Ὀδυσσέως at the end of the sentence is climactic and emphatic. For κακός without the article used substantively, cf. 984, 1371, *OC* 1384 κακῶν κάκιστε.

385–8 Ne. shifts from Od. to the Atreidai (τοὺς ἐν τέλει), whom he blames (αἰτιῶμαι) for his mistreatment. For, he says, a city or an army, taken as a whole, belongs to its leaders, and 'those of mortals who are disorderly | become evil through their teachers' words'. The thought and style of this passage have led most recent editors and critics to athetize all four lines (or 386–8 or 387–9) as interpolated. They argue that their sententious, gnomic quality and the abrupt shift to blaming 'those in authority' are strange, after the hyperbolic, highly personal attack on Od. in 371–84; that it was Od., not the sons of Atreus, who ordered Ne. to lie to Phil. and in so doing to insult Od. (54–6); that οἱ δ' ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν is language appropriate to unruly resisters of legitimate authority (cf. *Ant.* 660, 730), but not to so loyal a figure as Od. Finally, some also claim that 'teachers' misleading a city or army into becoming κακοί is a notion more appropriate to contemporary Athenian politics and society (cf. *Introd.*, p. 12) than to the world of the play. One might respond (1) that it is normal for a long *rhēsis* to end with a gnomic maxim or generalization; (2) that Ne.'s attack on the Atreidai is in keeping with his feigned anger at them for giving away his arms (365–6) and his desire to appeal to Phil., who holds them co-responsible with Od. for his sufferings (cf. 263–5, 314–15, 405–6); (3) that ἀκοσμοῦντες can denote those who are generally – not only politically – disorderly (cf. *Pl. Symp.* 188b3–4) or those who are personally riotous or rebellious; (4) that the play pointedly evokes Athens and its leaders elsewhere (cf. *Introd.*, pp. 21–3); (5) that perhaps Soph.'s audience, on hearing Ne. speak 385–8, would (should?) think that he himself had been corrupted by the teaching of political leaders into becoming evil and that (as we would say) he is projecting his experience onto Od., if only for rhetorical

purposes (cf. Pucci 204-5). On balance, it seems best to retain these lines, given their political and moral resonance and dramatic relevance, their unimpeachable diction and style, and the unanimous testimony of the MSS. (For divergent views, cf. Fraenkel 1977: 53-5, Reeve 1973: 168-9, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990a: 187-8.)

385 *κούκ αἰτιῶμαι* 'and yet I do not blame'. *καί* is here used in an adversative sense, like *καίτοι*, cf. *Tf.* 1072 *καί τόδ' οὐδ' ἂν εἷς ποτε* | ... *φαίη* ... , *OT* 567 *παρέσχομεν* (sc. *ἔρευνα*) ... *κούκ ἠκούσαμεν*, *OC* 6 *καί τόδ' ἐξαρκούν ἐμοί*. Cf. *GP* 292. *τούς ἐν τέλει* 'those in office', 'those in (highest) authority', cf. 925, *Aj.* 1352 *τῶν ἐν τέλει*, *Ant.* 67 *τοῖς ἐν τέλει βεβῶσι*. *τὸ τέλος* can mean 'the government', cf. [Aesch.] *Sept.* 1030.

386 *τῶν ἡγουμένων* 'belongs to its leaders', possess. gen.; cf. *Ant.* 738 *οὐ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἡ πόλις νομίζεται*; Perhaps, too, the gen. expresses 'a wider notion of association, connection with' (Moorhouse 51-2), as in *OT* 917 *ἐστὶ τοῦ λέγοντος* 'he is "at the will" (or: "under the influence") of the man speaking'.

387 *στρατός τε σύμπας*: the normal way of referring to the Greek army in the play, cf. 1243n. *οἱ ... βροτῶν*: for *ἀκοσμοῦντες*, see 385-8n. *βροτῶν* is partitive gen., cf. 304, *OC* 279 *τὸν εὐσεβῆ βροτῶν*.

389 *λόγος ... πᾶς*: assertions with *πᾶς* are common at the end (and sometimes the beginning) of long speeches. Here *πᾶς* is particularly emphatic because it is followed by a sense-break calling for strong punctuation at position 6. Cf. 241, 1240, *Aj.* 480 *πάντ' ἀκήκοας λόγον*, *Ant.* 402 *πάντ' ἐπίστασαι*, *El.* 680 *τὸ πᾶν φράσω*.

389-90 *στυγῶν ... φίλος*: Ne. ends strategically with the key word *φίλος*, in strong contrast to *στυγῶν* at the end of the previous line and expressing the relationship he wishes to establish with Phil.

391-402 Instead of the expected two-line trimeter response (or perhaps a stasimon), the chorus sing and dance ten lines of lyric dialogue, crying out to the Great Mother goddess, Earth, as they claim to have done at Troy, when the sons of Atreus violated and shamed Ne. by treacherously giving his father's arms to Od. The Chorus support Ne.'s lying story with their own lie, but they stop short of swearing a false oath by the goddess whom they invoke. In this way they (barely) preserve their conventional authority to interpret the events of the play in choral song, even while their attempt *τὸ παρὸν θεραπεύειν* (149) shows how such choral song can be manipulated and manipulative. 391-402 turn out to be the strophe to which 507-18 correspond as antistrophe, though until 507 the first stanza seems no more than an outburst of lyric dialogue. For such divided strophic pairs, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 362-72/669-79 (in two separate episodes); *OT* 649ff./678ff., *OC* 833-43/876-86, Eur. *Or.* 1353-65/1537-49. Like 391-402/507-18, the passages in *Hipp.* and *Or.* are mainly dochmiac, while the passages in *OT* and *OC* are iambo-dochmiac. 391-402 and 507-18 correspond not only metrically but thematically in the attitude they express toward divinity: in the strophe, the Chorus exploit their invocation of the Great Mother to support their master's lie, in the antistrophe they recommend to Ne. that he bring Phil.

home out of hatred for the Atreidai and 'fleeing the righteous anger of the gods' (517–18 τὰν θεῶν | νέμεσιν ἔκφυγών). In both stanzas, 'their betrayal of all that is inviolable in human life does not hesitate to take cover under the religion of inviolability' (Reinhardt 1979: 171).

Metre: strophe and antistrophe

391	ὄρεστέρα παμβῶτι Γᾶ,	iamb dim
507	οἴκτιρ', ἀναξ,· πολλῶν ἔλε-	
392	μᾶτερ αὐτοῦ Διός,	2 cr.
508	ξεν δυσοίστων πόνων	
393	ἅ τὸν μέγαν Πακτωλὸν εὐχρυσον νέμεις,	iamb trim
509	ἄθλ', οἶα μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν τύχοι φίλων.	
395	σὲ κάκεϊ, μᾶτερ πότνι', ἐπηυδῶμαν,	dochm dim
510	εἰ δὲ πικρούς, ἀναξ, ἔχθεις Ἀτρείδας,	
396	ὄτ' ἐς τόνδ' Ἀτρειδᾶν	2 ba
511	ἐγὼ μέν, τὸ κείνων	
397	ὑβρις πᾶσ' ἐχώρει,	2 ba
512	κακὸν τῷδε κέρδος	
398	ὅτε τὰ πάτρια τεύχεα παρεδίδοσαν,	dochm dim
515	μετατιθέμενος, ἔνθαπερ ἐπιμέμονεν,	
400	ἰὼ μάκαιρα ταυροκτόνων	ia + dochm
516	ἐπ' εὐστόλου ταχείας νεῶς	
401	λεόντων ἔφεδρε, τῷ Λαρτίου,	dochm dim
517	πορεύσαιμ' ἂν ἐς δόμους, τὰν θεῶν	
402	σέβας ὑπέρτατον.	dochm
518	νέμεσιν ἔκφυγών.	

This brief stanza consists of one long sentence and four metrical periods of 2, 4, 1, and 3 lines, respectively (though perhaps the dragged ending of 395/510 should also be understood as 'clausular', marking the end of a period: cf. 177 with metrical analysis). The metre is syncopated iambic that clearly defines itself

as dochmiac in the final four lines. First, two lines of iambic and cretic cola are followed by an iambic trimeter. Then two lines of dochmiacs – the first with conspicuous drag – are followed by two lines of bacchiacs that modulate through the highly resolved 398/512 into dochmiacs, which continue through the end of the stanza. Of all Greek metres, dochmiacs are most associated with intense emotion and presumably were accompanied by unusually animated dancing.

391–3 ὄρεστέρα... νέμεις: the Chorus cry out to the great mountain goddess of western Asia Minor, Kybele. Her main cult centre was in Sardis, located east of Smyrna on the Paktolos River, which was well known for the gold dust it washed down from Mt Tmolos (cf. Hdt. 1.93.1, 5.101.2). The Chorus syncretistically identify Kybele with Earth, the primal fertility goddess (παμβῶτι Γᾶ), with the Great Mother of the gods, and with Rhea, the mother of Zeus. Cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1301–68, where the Chorus identify Kybele with Demeter, the corn-goddess and mother of Kore, familiar to Athenians from the Eleusinian mysteries. Kybele, originally a non-Greek divinity, was worshipped in the Greek cities of Ionia from c. 600. By the late fifth century she had an official cult in the *Metroion*, next to (or perhaps within) the *Bouleuterion* in the Athenian agora. Even earlier, by the 460s, the worship of the Mother in the Lesser Mysteries at Agrai was preliminary to the Greater Mysteries of Demeter at Eleusis, and the ‘mountain mother’ was identified in poetry with Earth, Demeter, and Rhea and also associated with Dionysos. See *Hom. Hymn* 14 (‘To the Mother of the Gods’) 1–5 ‘Mother of all gods and all humans | ... | whom the sound of rattles and drums along with the roar of flutes | pleases, and the howling of wolves and fierce lions | and echoing mountains and wooded valleys’. Cf. fr. 269a.51, Melanippides *PMG* 764, Eur. *Ba.* 128–9. See too Aesch. *PV* 209–10 Θέμις | καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφή μία, Meleager *AP* 7.486.9–10 Γᾶ πάντροφε... μάτερ, Versnel 1990: 105–11, Parker 1996: 188–94. The Chorus’ invocation of the goddess has some of the typical features of a prayer, e.g. naming of the deity, reminder of the deity’s past relation to the speaker, use of the verb νέμειν to denote the deity’s activity. Here, however, the reminder is not of a past favour done by the speaker for the god or the god for the speaker, nor do the Chorus ask for anything in particular. On the surface, there seems to be no obvious reason why the Chorus should call on Kybele, of all gods, except that she was worshipped in both Greece and Asia Minor, including the Troad, and so could hear the Chorus in both places. If, however, a statement in the *Ethnika* of Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Λήμνος – that the island took its name ‘from the great goddess, whom they call Lemnos; to this goddess they even used to sacrifice virgins’ – preserves an accurate tradition about a cult of Kybele on Lemnos, the invocations by the Chorus would make sense, even though the island is uninhabited in the play. παμβῶτι ‘all-nourishing’ occurs only here in extant Greek. It calls attention to the nurturing quality of the earth that is crucial for Phil.’s survival on the island (Bers 1981: 503), cf. 1452–63. τὸν μέγαν Πакτωλὸν εὗχρυσον ‘great Paktolos rich in gold’.

Both adjs. are attributive, even though εὔχρυσον follows the noun without the def. article. For this kind of displacement when there is more than one attributive adj., cf. 986–7 τὸ παγκρατὲς σέλας | Ἥφαιστότευκτον, *Aj.* 134–5 τῆς ἀμφιρύτου | Σαλαμῖνος ἔχων βάθρον ἀγχιάλου. In the only other occurrence of εὔχρυσος in extant Greek literature (*Max. Tyr.* 27.3), the adj. describes Sardis.

395 **κάκει**... ἐπηυδῶμαν Ἴ cried out to you there too [i.e. at Troy], goddess mother'. πότνια, an archaic fem. of πόσις 'master of the house' (cognate with Lat. *potis, posse*, etc.), can be used of various female divinities, including Artemis, Leto, Demeter and Kore, Hera, Earth, and the Erinyes/Eumenides. The epic formula πότνια μήτηρ (21x *Il.*, 16x *Od.*) and πότνια alone can describe both immortal and mortal females and express honour or respect. In the context of the Mother of the Gods/Earth/Kybele riding on bull-slaying lions (400–1), πότνια may recall the description of Artemis at *Il.* 21.470 πότνια θηρῶν 'powerful over wild beasts'; cf. *Eur. Hec.* 70 πότνια Χθών. **ἐπηυδῶμαν**: ἐπαυδάω occurs only here in extant Greek literature, except for the lexicon of Hesychios (fifth century CE) and the *Suda* (tenth–eleventh centuries CE). In contrast to ἐπικαλοῦμαι, which is more usual in private prayers and invocations of gods, ἐπαυδῶμαι may draw attention to the loud and public nature of the Chorus' speech act. The middle probably is by analogy with ἐπικαλοῦμαι, but may also suggest the Chorus' personal distress at Ne.'s (supposedly) having been wronged by the Atreidai and Od.

395–9 **ἐπηυδῶμαν**... **ἐχῶρει**... **παρεδίδοσαν**: the three successive imperfects make the Chorus' account more vivid. The second *ὅτε* clause (399) explains the nature of the ὕβρις mentioned more generally in the first (396–7), thus intensifying the pathos of Ne.'s suffering, as do the resolved dochmiacs in 399. **τόνδ'**: Ne., toward whom the Ch. gesture as they sing. **ὅτ'**... **ἐχῶρει** 'when against this man all the outrage of the Atreidai was advancing', cf. *Ti.* 303–4 μή ποτ' εἰσίδοιμί σε | πρὸς τοῦμόν... σπέρμα χωρήσαντά ποι. For πᾶς 'all' = 'total', 'complete', cf. 141–2 τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν | πᾶν κράτος. That the words ὕβρις πᾶς constitute a single *baccheus* makes it unlikely that πᾶς is predicate adj. ('advanced with full force').

400–1 **ἰὼ**... **ἔφεδρε**: a parenthetical cry to the goddess, like the one the Chorus say (395) they cried out at Troy. The break in syntax emphasizes 401 τῷ Λαρτίου, the delayed indir. obj. of 399 παρεδίδοσαν. **ταυροκτόνων**... **ἔφεδρε**: probably, '(riding) seated on (the backs of) bull-slaying lions'; possibly, 'riding seated on (a chariot drawn by) bull-slaying lions' or 'seated on (a throne decorated with images of) bull-slaying lions'. All three images are found in visual representations of Kybele. *ἔφεδρε* governs the gen. *ταυροκτόνων* | *λεόντων* (cf. *Eur. Ion* 202 *πετροῦντος ἔφεδρον ἵππου*, *Pliny HN* 35.109 *deum... matrem in leone sedentem*, describing a fourth-century painting by Nikomachos). Lions are traditionally the most dominant animals; *ταυροκτόνων* further enhances their power and thus the power of Kybele who rides them. Cf. *Il.* 16.487–9 *ἥ ὅτε ταῦρον ἔπεφνε λέων*.

402 σέβας ὑπέρτατον is in apposition to 399 τὰ πάτρια τεύχεα. Ne.'s arms, made for his father by Hephaistos, are an object of reverence like Phil.'s bow (cf. 656-7), the gift of Herakles, who in some versions of the story had received it from Apollo (cf. Diod. Sic. 4.13.3, [Apollod.] 2.4.11).

403-506 The second main part of the first episode has two sections: (1) 403-67, a conversation between Phil. and Ne. in exchanges of 1-5 lines, framed by Phil.'s nine-line speech expressing belief in Ne. and the Ch. (403-11), and thirteen lines in which Ne. tells Phil. that he and the Chorus are departing (453-65); (2) 468-506, a formal *rhēsis* by Phil. in which he tries to persuade Ne. to 'save' him from the island and bring him home.

403-4 ἔχοντες . . . πεπλεύκατε 'you have sailed to us, strangers, having, as it seems, a clear token (consisting) of grief'. σύμβολον literally denotes one of two parts of a piece of pottery, knucklebones, or other (usually small) item that has been cut or broken in two, which could be used to identify the person carrying it to the person holding the other part. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 613 ξένοις τε πέμπειν σύμβολ', Pl. *Symp.* 191d5 ζητεῖ δὴ αἰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος ξύμβολον. λύπης is gen. of definition with σύμβολον, cf. 159-60 οἶκον . . . κοίτης, Smyth §1295. πρὸς ἡμᾶς goes primarily with πεπλεύκατε (which would be vague without an indication of the 'end of motion'), but also is felt with σύμβολον ('a counter-sign [addressed to] us'). This kind of double application is common when an adv. or adv. phrase can modify both the preceding and the following words. Cf. 378 πρὸς ἀξήκουσεν.

405 καὶ μοι προσάιδεθ' 'and you sing in harmony with me', i.e. 'are in accord with me'. The musical metaphor refers to the stanza just sung by the Chorus, but also has a more general sense; cf. *OT* 1113 ξυνάιδει τῷδε τάνδρι σύμμετρος. ὥστε γινώσκειν 'with the result that I recognize', understanding με from μοι as subj. of γινώσκειν, cf. 459-60 ἔξαρκούντά μοι | ἔσται . . . , ὥστε τέρεπθεαι. Originally γινώσκω means 'know by seeing', i.e. 'recognize'; in Homer it is often used with (or in the neighbourhood of) a verb of seeing, e.g. *Il.* 14.153-5 Ἥρη δ' εἰσεῖδε χρυσόθρονος ὀφθαλμοῖσι | . . . αὐτίκα ἔγνω | τὸν μὲν πομπήνουντα . . . , 17.84-6 πάπτηνεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα κατὰ στίχας, αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω | τὸν μὲν ἀπαινύμενον κλυτὰ τεύχεα, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ | κείμενον.

405-6 ὅτι . . . Ὀδυσσεύς 'that these are the deeds of the Atreidai and of Odysseus'. For the omission of the article, an epicism, cf. *OC* 471 τοῦτο χεῦμ'. ἐκ + gen. often denotes a person or means by which a thing is done, cf. 88, 1422.

407-8 ἔξοιδα . . . πανουργίας 'for I know well (ἐξ-) that he would apply his tongue to every evil, rationalizing speech and (every) villainy'. Cf. *OC* 761-2 ὦ πάντα τολμῶν κάπὸ παντὸς ἄν φέρων | λόγου δικαίου μηχάνημα ποικίλον (describing Kreon), *Ant.* 301 παντὸς ἔργου (etymologizing πανουργίας in 300). ἔξοιδα introduces indirect discourse with the participle (ἄν . . . θιγόντα = 801 θίγοι ἄν), in which ἄν marks the hypothetical force of θιγόντα, indicating a general probability. On *Od.* and γλῶσσα, cf. 96-9 with n. λόγος and λέγειν, too, are consistently associated with *Od.*'s villainy and Ne.'s execution of *Od.*'s plan, e.g. 55, 64, 100-1, 131, 1267-9.

408-9 ἀφ' ἧς . . . μέλλοι ποιεῖν 'when the rel. clause expresses a [fut. less vivid condition . . .], and the antecedent clause contains an opt. referring to the future, the rel. clause takes the opt. (without ἄν)' (*GMT* §531, cf. Smyth §2786a). Cf. *OC* 560-1 δεινὴν γὰρ τιν' ἄν προᾶξιν τύχοις | λέξας ὁποῖας ἐξαφισταμένην ἐγώ. Phil. says μηδὲν δίκαιον (virtually a litotes for ἀδίκον τι) rather than οὐδέν, because μή is the normal generic neg. in the protasis of a fut. less vivid condition. The pres. inf. after μέλλοι suggests that Od. wills or intends to accomplish 'nothing just'. The fut. indic. would imply that he thinks he actually will accomplish 'nothing just'. Cf. Smyth §1959a, *GMT* §73. ἐς τέλος 'in the end'. Cf. Eur. *IA* 160-1 θνητῶν δ' ὀλβιος | ἐς τέλος οὐδεὶς, *LSJ* s.v. τέλος π.2.b.

410-11 ἀλλ' οὐ τι . . . ἠνείχετο 'no, this is in no respect a wonder to me, but (it is a wonder) if the greater Ajax, being present, endured seeing this'. The first ἀλλά indicates Phil.'s substitution of the true for the false, while ἀλλ' . . . οὐ . . . expresses the incompatibility of the notion that Ne. was wronged by Od. and the sons of Atreus with the idea that Ajax was alive (*GP*: 1-2). γε, as often, is attached to a personal pronoun (ἐμοί), even though it limits the sense of another word in the sentence (τοῦτο). The double augment is normal in the imperf. mid. of ἀνέχω, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 905 ἠνείχομεσθα, Thuc. 1.77.5 ἠνείχοντο. Αἶας ὁ μείζων: Ajax, son of Telamon, in contrast to Αἶας ὁ μείων, the son of Oileus.

412 ἦν . . . ζῶν: in periphrases combining a pres. participle with a copulative verb, the participle is equivalent to a pred. adj. or substantive. Cf. *OT* 1045 ἦ κάστ' ἔτι ζῶν οὖτος . . . ; (οὐκ) ἦν at the beginning of a sentence is often emphatic.

412-13 οὐ . . . ἐγώ: a mixed contrary-to-fact condition. Usually the protasis and apodosis would both have imperf. indic. (present time) or both have aor. indic. (past time). Here the protasis is, 'If that man were living', but the apodosis shifts to the aor. to emphasize that moment at which Ne. was stripped of his arms (almost as if he had been slain in battle). Cf. 443 εἶλετ' with 443-4n. ταῦτ' is internal adv. acc. with οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε . . . ἐσυλήθην ἐγώ. The verb and personal pronoun at the end of the sentence and the line convey emphasis. In the standard version of the story, Ajax commits suicide following the award of Achilles' arms to Od., immediately after the burial of Achilles. The *Aithiopis* of Achilles' arms to Od., immediately after the burial of Achilles. The *Aithiopis* ended with the story of the contest for the arms (*Argumentum*, Bernabé 69 = West 2003: 112-13); the *Little Iliad* began with the awarding of the arms to Odysseus and the madness and suicide of Ajax (*Argumentum*, Bernabé 74 = West 2003: 120-1). Ajax might, then, be thought to have died shortly after Ne. arrived at Troy, if Ne. actually saw Achilles' corpse before it was burned (cf. 359-60n.). It is, however, impossible for an audience or reader of the play to know precisely when Ajax is supposed to have died, (1) because it is impossible to know whether Ne. is lying or telling the truth about how soon after his father's death he came to Troy, and (2) because Soph. is unlikely to have been concerned with chronological precision or consistency. In effect, Ne.'s reply to Phil. ignores the story of the judgement of

the arms (cf. 1365–65b with n.); from what he says, Phil. might well believe that Ajax died in battle.

414 ἀλλ' ἦ... θανών 'but is this man too dead and gone'? The present οἴχεται 'is gone' is virtually equivalent to the perfect ('has gone'), as is common with verbs involving 'unity of character or persistence of result', e.g. νικῶ, ἤκω, ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι, στέρομαι, and all verbs of privation (*SCG* 1. 87). ἀλλ' ἦ expresses surprise (ἀλλ') as it asks a question (ἦ). It is common in dialogue after an exclamation, exclamatory question (as here), or apostrophe (*GP* 27–8), e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 219–20 Ορ. 88' εἰμί· μὴ μάτευ' ἐμοῦ μᾶλλον φίλον. Ηλ. ἀλλ' ἦ δόλον τιν', ὦ ξέν', ἀμφί μοι πλέκεις; Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 58 πῶς εἶπας; ἀλλ' ἦ καὶ σοφὸς λέληθας ὦν;

415 μηκέτι is used instead of οὐκέτι, because Ajax is considered to belong to a general class or group (the dead). Cf. 107, 253; contrast 359, 412. ὥς marks the mental viewpoint of the subj. of νόει (cf. 253, *GMT* §916, K–G II. 94), which makes it difficult to take μηκέτι... νόει as a neg. imper. The association between light and life is traditional. Cf. the Homeric formula ὄρᾶν φάος ἡλείοιο, in contrast to the darkness of death (e.g. τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυπεν). Cf. 624–5 with n., 663–4 with n.

416 οἶμοι τάλας 'woe is me', referring to Phil. himself, not Ajax. Cf. *OT* 744, Ar. *Av.* 1494. ὁ Τυδέως γόνος is Diomedes, Od.'s companion in the night-spying in Book 10 of the *Il.*, in the murder of Palamedes (*Kypria* fr. 30 Bernabé = fr. 27 West [= Paus. 10.31.2]), and in the theft of the Palladion, the statue of Pallas Athena on which Troy's safety depended (*Ilias Parva, Argumentum* 1, Bernabé 75; West 2003: 122–3). In Eur. *Philoktetes*, according to D. Chr. 52.14 = *TrGF* 5: 829, *Test.* iv c.13–14, Diomedes and Od. together bring Phil. from Lemnos to Troy. Cf. 570, *Intro.*, p. 6.

417 οὐδ'... Λαερτίῳ 'nor the son of Sisypheos bought by Laertes'. In such 'son of' constructions, the definite article usually comes immediately before the gen. of origin, e.g. 402 τῷ Λαρτίου, 628 τὸν Λαερτίου, *Aj.* 450 ἡ Διός. Here, in οὐμπολητός, the attributive ἐμπολητός is used as if παῖς were to follow Σισύφου (or as if Phil. considered ἐμπολητός so integral to Od.'s identity as to be part of his name). Calling Od. the son of Sisypheos is abusive, as references to Sisypheos almost always are. According to Σ on 417, Od.'s mother, Antikleia, was pregnant by Sisypheos, when she was sold to Laertes as a bride. Σ on *Aj.* 190 tells a fuller story, according to which Antikleia's father Autolykos arranged for Sisypheos to impregnate his daughter; then sold her to Laertes. Cf. 624–5, *Aj.* 190 with Σ, who quotes fr. 567 ὥς ὁ Σίσυφος πολὺς | ἐνδηλος ἐν σοί (probably spoken by Achilles to Od. in *Philoktetes at Troy*) and Aesch. fr. 175 ἀλλ' Ἄντικλείας ἄσσον ἦλθε Σίσυφος, | τῆς σῆς λέγω τοι μητρός, ἥ σ' ἐγείνατο. For Od. as the son of Sisypheos, cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 104, *Id* 524, Ovid *Met.* 13.31–2.

418 οὐ μὴ θάνωσι 'they will certainly not die', cf. 103 with n., 381. Here οὐ μὴ is even stronger than usual, after 416–17 οὐχ... οὐχ... οὐδ'... τοῦσδε... ἔδει 'for they ought not to live'. The imperf. indic. of verbs denoting

obligation, without *ἀν* and with an inf., implies a contrary-to-fact condition in present time. In such a construction, the action of the inf. is always denied; cf. *GM* §419, Smyth §§1774-5.

419 οὐ... καὶ 'they ought not, indeed; know this much, for sure; but in fact...'. The asyndeton is emphatic. ἀλλὰ καὶ form a unit, as usual, but καὶ is also felt with μέγα: 'but actually they are blossoming – in fact, greatly'.

420 θάλλοντες 'blossoming', i.e. 'flourishing'. For the metaphor, cf. *Ant.* 703 πατὴρ θάλλοντος. *Tr.* 235 καὶ ζῶντα καὶ θάλλοντα. The periphrasis (participle + εἶσι) is stronger than θάλλουσι would be, and νῦν, at position 6 but modifying εἶσι at position 5, adds further emphasis: 'they are blossoming greatly now (i.e. with the others dead)'.

421-2 τί... ἔστιν 'but then again, what of the old and good man, and (thus) my friend, Nestor the Pylian – is he (still) alive'?

422-3 τά γε... ἐξήρκει various commentators have asked, how could Phil. know this, if he had never been to Troy? and they have provided various answers, e.g. he speaks of what he had seen during the voyage to Troy or heard about from other visitors to Lemnos. But such realistic interpretations are unnecessary and unproductive. Attic tragedy, unlike modern drama, is more concerned with what is poetically relevant than with what is realistically possible or probable. Thus Hermann's τάχ' ἂν in 422 and κακ' ἐξήρκε in 423 are unnecessary. ἐξερύκω occurs only here in extant Greek literature. σοφά is adv. acc. of the internal obj. with βουλευών.

424 καίνος γε... κακῶς 'yes, (he used to), but that man fares badly now'. For γε in affirmative answers, cf. 105n., *GP* 130-1.

425 ὅς παρῆν: Toup's emendation of ὅσπερ ἦν, found in all MSS, neatly restores an allusion to the story, told in the *Aithiopis*, of Antilochos dying in battle at the hands of Memnon to save the life of his father Nestor. Cf. *Aithiopis*, *Argumentum*, Bernabé 69 = West 2003: 112-13, Pind. *Pyth.* 6.38-9. (In *Il.* 8.80 ff., the story is adapted to make Diomedes rescue Nestor from Hektor's onslaught.) θανών... φροῦδος: cf. 414 οἴχεται θανών. For ellipsis of εἶναι with φροῦδος, cf. 561, Eur. *Med.* 492 ὄρκων δὲ φροῦδη πίστις. αὐτῶι is dat. of disadvantage, as the word-order suggests; it is not governed by παρῆν.

426-7 δὺ... κλύειν 'those two, again, of whom you spoke, are men whom I would least have wished to hear of as having perished'. The two men, whose deaths cause Phil. such sorrow, must be Ajax and Antilochos, since mention of the death of Achilles is too far away to be indicated by the deictic τῷδ'. If the reference were to Antilochos and Nestor, ὀλωλότοιιν would have to mean 'undone', 'ruined', since Nestor is not dead. οἶν... ὀλωλότοιιν is gen. dual, after κλύειν. δὺ αὐτως (or αὐτῶς) δεῖν' ἔλεξας, the reading of the MSS, gives an unsatisfactory sense, 'you spoke terrible things likewise of two', which is vague in the context. Porson, guided by Σ αὐτῶ δ' ἐξέδειξας, proposed αὐ τῷδ' ἐξέδειξας. Blaydes and Jebb (independently), questioning the appropriateness of ἐξέδειξας 'you pointed (them) out', retained ἔλεξας and suggested ἀνδρ(ε) in place

of δειν', which puts the emphasis on the two comrades dearest to Phil. **ἀν ἡθέλησ'**... κλύειν amounts to a contrary-to-fact apodosis. Cf. 1239 κλύειν ἄν οὐδ'... ἐβουλόμην, 1278 ἦθελον... ἄν σε πεισθῆναι, *GMT* §245.

428-30 τί... νεκρόν: the first of the ethically charged, unanswerable questions to which his exchange with Ne. leads Phil. Cf. 451-2. τί... σκοπεῖν: 'what, then, should I look out for' (i.e. 'expect'), an unusual sense of σκοπεῖν, which more often means 'look for', 'seek'. Perhaps the closest parallel in emotional tone and sense is *OT* 964-5 'alas, alas, what should one expect for himself (σκοποῖτο) in regard to the hearth of the Pythian prophet or to the birds shrieking overhead...?' After τί, δεῖ or χρή + inf. or the verbal adj. in -τέον can have the same force as a deliberative subjunctive, cf. *SCG* 1. 152.

429-30 Ὀδυσσεύς... νεκρόν 'but again, here too (i.e. 'in this instance'), Od. is (still) alive (just as he always survives), where he ought, instead of these men, to be spoken of as a corpse'. αὖ goes closely with κἀνταῦθ'. Possibly there is dramatic irony in ἔστιν αὖ κἀνταῦθ', whereby Phil. also would be saying, without realizing it, that Od. 'is alive here too (i.e. on Lemnos)'. **χρήν... αὐτὸν αὐδᾶσθαι**: cf. 418 τούσδε... ἔδει with n.

431-2 σοφός... θαμά: Ne. calls Phil. by name for the first time, a sign of their new friendship. His references to Od. as a cunning wrestler (cf. *Il.* 23.725-7) and to his σοφαὶ γνῶμαι are calculated to strengthen this friendship by disparaging Phil.'s enemy, and he might seem to an audience to be laying it on thickly. Cf. 1244, where Ne. mocks Od. to his face as σοφὸς πεφυκώς. Wrestling terminology is used figuratively for sophists and sophistic cleverness both in law-court speeches (e.g. Aeschines 3.205 πάλαισμα τοῦτ' ἐστὶ δικαστηρίου) and in general (e.g. *Ar. Ran.* 877-8 ὅταν εἰς ἕριν ὀξυμερίμοις | ἔλθωσι στρεβλοῖσι παλαίσμασιν ἀντιλογοῦντες 'when they come into conflict, debating with cunning, keenly considered wrestling (tricks)'. ἐμποδίζονται may refer to a wrestling move by which one trips up an opponent, though no such use of the word is found elsewhere. Cf. *Ar. Eq.* 262-3 διαβαλὼν, ἀγκυρίσας, | εἴτ' ἀποστρέψας τὸν ὤμον αὐτὸν ἐνεκολήθασας 'having slandered, having tripped (him) up, then having twisted back (his) shoulder, you trampled (him)'. Cf. Dodds on *Eur. Ba.* 201-3.

433 φέρ' εἰπέ: in second-person commands and exhortations, φέρε (often with δῆ or νυν) may precede the imperative; cf. 300 with n. For φέρ' εἰπέ, cf. *Ant.* 534, *Tr.* 890.

433-4 πρὸς... Πάτροκλος 'by the gods, where was Patroklos for you (σοι: ethical dat.) at this juncture?' (cf. 429 ἐνταῦθα). γάρ either marks Phil.'s surprise that Patroklos did not come to Ne.'s assistance (cf. 248 with n., 249) or is a sign of Phil.'s requesting further information (cf. 161). θεῶν is pronounced as a monosyllable by synizesis, as often happens with gen. forms in -εως or -εων and with forms of θεός. Cf. 196n. **τὰ φίλτατα** 'dearest friend', cf. *El.* 1208, where *El.* calls what she thinks are her brother's ashes τὰ φίλτατα. At *OC* 1110, Oidipous uses the same phrase of his daughters, whom Theseus has rescued. Here τὰ φίλτατα probably alludes to Achilles' and Patroklos' sexual relationship. Cf.

Aesch. fr. 134a (= Pl. *Symp.* 180a4-7), 135, 136 (from *Myrmidons*), with Michelakis 2002: 41-52.

435 λόγῳ... ἐν βραχεῖ: cf. *El.* 763 ἐν βραχεῖ... λέγω, Aesch. *PV* 505 βραχεῖ... μύθῳ... μάθε.

436 τοῦτ' ἐκδιδάξω: τοῦτ', rather than the more usual τόδε(ε), looks forward to the following words.

436-7 πόλεμος... αἶε: cf. fr. 724 (from *Phrygians*): 'My son, Ares likes to kill the noble and brave; but those who are bold with their tongues, fleeing ruin, are outside of evils. For Ares gathers for himself nothing of evils'. Cf. *AP* 7.160.2 (attributed to Anacreon but perhaps Hellenistic) Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἀγαθῶν φείδεται ἀλλὰ κακῶν. ἐκῶν 'on purpose', 'by choice', cf. *Il.* 10.372 ἐκῶν δ' ἡμάρτανε φωτός. This does not exclude the possibility that war may unintentionally kill some πονηροί, though 'by choice' it 'always kills the good'.

438 κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτό γε 'in accordance with this very thing', i.e. 'on this very point'.

439 ἀναξίου... ἐξερήσομαι: the gen. is often used with verbs of saying and hearing to indicate the person or thing to whom or which reference is made, cf. 441 ποίου δὲ τούτου... ἐρεῖς; Cf. Moorhouse 73n. ἐξερήσομαι usually takes an acc.

440 τί νῦν κυρεῖ 'how he is doing now', an indir. question dependent on ἐξερήσομαι. Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 214 τί νῦν... κυρῶ;

441 ποίου... ἐρεῖς 'what sort of man (is this) of whom you mean to speak, except Odysseus'? Ne. calculatedly brings up Od. again, cf. 431-2n. For the gen., cf. 439 with n., 1204 with n. For ποῖος + demonstrative, see 572, 1204; cf. Moorhouse 161-3. ἐρῶ, a fut. form in use with pres. φημί and aor. εἶπον (cf. 442), indicates the intention of the speaker, what he means to say. Cf. 1204, 1233 τί λέξεις with n.

443-4 ὅς... ἐώη 'who would never have chosen to speak (only) once, (in a situation) where no one would allow (him to speak at all)'. ἐώη is iterative imperf. indic. (cf. 289-92n., *GMT* §249); εἴλετ' with ἄν marks the moment of (never) choosing to speak (only) once (cf. 412-13 ἄν... ἐσυλήθη with n.). These verses are almost meta-literary, as if Phil. is paraphrasing or glossing the description of Thersites at *Il.* 2.212 as ἀμετροεπής. Cf. 377 δύσοργος with 377-8n. μηδεὶς Thersites at *Il.* 2.212 as ἀμετροεπής. Cf. 377 δύσοργος with 377-8n. μηδεὶς cf. *Aj.* 1184 κἄν μηδεὶς ἔα. 'No one would allow' means 'everyone would forbid', just as 'he never would have chosen to speak only once' signifies 'he always would choose to speak often'.

444 τοῦτον... κυρεῖ: prolepsis (or anticipation), when the subj. of a dependent clause is made the obj. of the verb of the main clause, is common with a demonstrative or personal pron. in an indirect question. Cf. 534-5, 544-549-50, 573-4, Smyth §2182, K-G II.2: 579-80.

445 οὐκ... ὄντα νιν: Ne. did not see 'him' (Thersites) but heard he was still living (ἐτ' ὄντα νιν = ἐτι ζῶντα, cf. 358, 415). Ne.'s reply goes against the traditional story, told in the *Aithiopis* (*Argumentum*, Bernabé 68, West 2003: 110-11).

that Achilles killed Thersites for reviling him and reproaching him for his alleged love of Penthesilea, the Amazon queen whom Achilles had killed. According to Σ, Achilles killed Thersites because he stabbed the corpse of Penthesilea in the eye and accused Achilles of falling in love with her and having intercourse with her, after she was dead.

446–52 Phil. sums up the apparent perversity of the gods, who preserve evil men and send good men to Hades, and asks another unanswerable question about divine justice (cf. 428–30). Other Sophoklean figures such as Antigone and Hyllos, call into question the gods' treatment of themselves and their families (*Ant.* 921–6, *Tr.* 1266–9), but Phil. moves from news of the death of his friends and survival of his enemies to general doubt about the gods' own moral standing.

446 ἐμελλ': sc. εἶναι, 'He would be (living)'. Cf. *Ant.* 448 τί δ' οὐκ ἐμελλον (sc. εἶναι). ἐπεὶ οὐδέν . . . ἀπώλετο: -ει οὐ- is scanned as a single syllable by synizesis, cf. 948, 1037, fr. 524.3 (from *Polyxena*) ἐπεὶ οὐδ'. γε is both limitative and emphatic: 'nothing *evil*, at least, has yet perished'. For the sentiment, cf. *TrGF* 2, fr. *adespot.* 344 οὐδέν κακὸν . . . ῥαδίως ἀπόλλυται.

447 περιστέλλουσιν 'protect' (LSJ s.v. iii.2). Cf. Hdt. 9.60.2 ἀμυνομένους . . . δυνάμεθα . . . περιστέλλειν ἀλλήλους. αὐτά: sc. (τὰ) κακά, from 447 κακόν. The substantival neut. adj. is stronger than the masculine would be. Cf. 448 τὰ μὲν πανοῦργα καὶ παλιντριβῆ.

448 παλιντριβῆ 'rubbed again (and again)', 'knavish'; cf. Σ τετριμμένα τοῖς κακοῖς. Presumably the meaning comes from the idea of being 'rubbed' over and over and thus becoming 'well practised in knavery', cf. *Ant.* 177 νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς. Cf. τριῖμμα 'a knave'.

448–9 καὶ πως . . . χαίρουσιν 'and somehow they enjoy . . .'. πως softens Phil.'s statement, cf. Eur. *Med.* 119–20 δεινὰ τυράννων λήματα καὶ πως | ὀλίγ' ἀρχόμενοι.

449 ἀναστρέφοντες . . . Αἰδου refers primarily to the gods delaying the deaths of those who are wicked and knavish, but also, perhaps, to Od.'s 'father' Sisyphos, who famously kept himself alive by binding Death, so that no human could die, until Zeus sent Ares to free him; then Sisyphos contrived to return to life, after he had died, by instructing his wife, Merope, not to perform the customary funeral rites, so that Hades sent him back up to the world of the living to reproach her, where he stayed until he died again in old age (Pherekydes, *EGM* fr. 119 = Σ *Il.* 6.153). In another version of the story, Sisyphos cleverly persuaded Persephone to allow him to come back to the light of the sun (cf. Theogn. 703–4, 711–12). Cf. 624–5 with 625n.

450 ἀποστέλλουσιν 'send away (from the world of the living)', in strong contrast to 447 περιστέλλουσιν as a divine treatment of human beings. Cf. 624–5 with n. (Sisyphos).

451–2 ποῦ . . . κακοῦς 'where should I place these things, where praise (them), when | praising the things having to do with the gods I find the gods (themselves) (responsible for) evil'? For ποῦ 'where'? = 'on what basis', cf. *Aj.* 1100

ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε,, OT 390 ποῦ σὺ μάντις εἴ σαφής; For τίθημι/τίθεμαι used of mental action, cf. *El.* 1269–70 δαιμόνιον | αὐτὸ τίθημι' ἐγὼ, *Eur. Andr.* 210 τὴν δὲ Σκυῖρον οὐδαμοῦ τίθης. Phil.'s rhetorical question gains force from the repetitions ποῦ . . . ποῦ, αἰνεῖν . . . ἐπαινῶν, and τὰ θεῖ' . . . τοὺς θεοὺς. ἐπαινῶν is probably temporal ('while praising') rather than conative ('trying to praise') or concessive ('although praising'), though all three senses may be present to different members of the audience or different readers. Cf. *Theogn.* 743–52 on the problem of revering the gods, when the good suffer and the evil prosper. For the gods as κακοὺς ('responsible for') evil', cf. 992n.

453–60 Ne. is not prepared to engage in a discussion of divine justice, and changes the subject to human morality and his own future action.

453 ἐγὼ μὲν: speeches in tragedy often open with a μὲν to which there is no corresponding δέ (μὲν *solitarium*), e.g. 1, *Ant.* 223, OT 1369, *El.* 516. Ne. begins and ends his speech in the first person, as if only he, and not Phil., had reason to hate the Atreidai. ὦ . . . πατρός: a lofty and distant form of address (cf. 4n.), utterly different from 432 Φιλοκτῆτ'.

454–50 τὸ . . . φυλάξομαι 'in the future, from now on, I, for my part, will be wary of Ilion and the Atreidai, looking at them from afar'. For the idiom, see *Tr.* 81 τὸν λοιπὸν ἤδη βίον, 168, 921 τὸ λοιπὸν ἤδη. ἤδη is often joined with other expressions of time, e.g. 1461–2 νῦν . . . ἤδη. Here, it expresses the notion that Ne.'s future behaviour will be the result of what has happened in the past. Cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἤδη 6, K–G II. 121.

456–7 ὅπου δ' . . . κρατεῖ 'and wherever the (morally) worse (man) is stronger than the (morally) good (man), and virtue wastes away and the clever man dominates – of these men I never shall be fond'. For the form of the sentence, in which the rel. adv. ὅπου takes the place of ἐν ᾧ, cf. *Aj.* 1081–3 ὅπου δ' ὑβρίζειν δρᾶν θ' ἅ βούλεται παρῆι, | ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνῳ ποτὲ | . . . πεσεῖν. Brunck's δειλός 'coward' for δεινός may be right; δεινός, however, is consistent with the play's emphasis on Od.'s cleverness, and the contrast between τὰ χρηστά ('virtue') and ὁ δεινός ('the clever man') seems more effective than that between τὰ χρηστά and ὁ δειλός.

459–60 ἐξαρκοῦσά μοι . . . δόμῳ 'will be sufficient for me henceforth, with the result that I rejoice in my home'. For omitted με understood from μοι as subj. ofτέρπεσθαι, cf. 405. Ne.'s 'feigned nostalgia is well calculated to exasperate Phil.'s all too real . . . desire for going home' (Kamerbeek 83).

462 χαῖρ' ὡς μέγιστα, χαῖρε: cf. Shakespeare, *Henry VIII* 3.2.351 'Farewell, a long farewell . . . '.

462–3 καὶ σε . . . μεταστήσειαν 'and may the gods change you (i.e. 'deliver you') from (your) disease'. νόσου is ablative gen. of separation. Cf. *Eur. IT* 991 θέλω δ' ἅπερ σὺ, σέ τε μεταστήσαι πόνων, *Hel.* 1442 βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ μετάστησον κακῶν.

464–5 ἡμεῖς . . . ὁρμώμεθα: Ne. turns away from Phil. and speaks to the Chorus. ὡς . . . τηνικαῦθ' ὁρμώμεθα is a purpose clause, dependent on ἵωμεν and

containing within itself the conditional protasis ὅπηνικ' ἄν... εἴκηι, to which an independent ὁρμώμεθα might serve as the apodosis. πλοῦν ἡμιν εἴκηι

'yields to us a sailing' (LSJ *s.v.* εἴκω II). εἴκειν rarely has a noun in the acc. as direct obj., but cf. *Il.* 23.337 εἰξάι τέ οἱ ἡνία. In *Od.* 5.332 Εὐρος Ζεφύρῳ εἰξασκε διώκειν, διώκειν is expegetical inf. and there is no acc.

466 ἦδη, τέκνον, στέλλεσθε: these three words and the subsequent *antilabē* convey Phil.'s shock, sense of betrayal, disappointment, and temporary inability to say more than 'are you setting forth already'?

466–7 καιρός... σκοπεῖν 'Yes (γάρ, see *GP* 73–4, 81–2), the opportune moment calls (on us) to watch for (the chance of) sailing not from out of sight (of the ship) but from nearby'. A certain harshness in Ne.'s response (double prodelision of ε after η) may indicate his discomfort at the helplessness to which he has reduced Phil. καιρός signifies the critical, desirable, or opportune moment for successful action. Like ἀκμή (12) and τὸ παρόν (159, 283), καιρός is associated with the verbal intrigue of Od. and with Ne. and the Ch. when they carry out this intrigue (151, 837, cf. 1279). For a more authoritative sense of what is opportune and what constitutes a favourable 'sailing', see 1450–1. For the personification of καιρός, cf. 837–8, 1450, *El.* 75–6 καιρός... | μέγιστος ἔργου παντός ἐστ' ἐπιστάτης.

468–506 After a brief pause, Phil. begins his second long *rhēsis* (thirty-eight lines), in which he implores and supplicates Ne. to rescue him from the island and bring him home, or to a place from which he can easily return home. Supplication (ἱκεσία, Attic ἱκετεία, from the same root as ἴκω, ἱκνέομαι, ἱκάνω 'reach' 'arrive at') was a socio-religious act, a prayer, in which one person, the suppliant (ἱκέτης), gave up any effort and right to self-preservation, placed himself or herself wholly in the power of another person, and asked (and at the same time morally constrained) that person to take responsibility for his or her safety and the fulfilment of his or her requests. Supplication involved conventional words and gestures (e.g. going down on one's knees, trying to touch the knees of the person supplicated); there could be either actual, physical contact with the person whom the suppliant 'reached' or merely symbolic or figurative language and gestures of appeal. A suppliant's request was considered to be in the name of Zeus, the patron god of suppliants (cf. 484 Ζηνὸς ἱκεσίου), who sometimes is himself referred to as the suppliant (e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 1 Ζεὺς μὲν ἀφίκτωρ); thus rejection or abuse of a suppliant was in effect rejection or abuse of Zeus. As an institution and concept involving reciprocity (I give you myself in the name of Zeus; you protect me and Zeus will reward you), supplication resembles φιλότης/φιλία, αἰδώς, and χάρις. Cf. Gould 1973: 74–103 = 2001: 22–77. Here the result of the supplication is unusual, because the Chorus rather than Ne. respond (507–18), and Ne. never actually says 'Yes' to Phil.'s entreaty, but instead tells the Chorus that it would be αἰσχρὰ on his part 'to appear to the stranger more lacking than you in regard to toiling at what is opportune' (524–5). Although Phil. hails Ne. for granting his supplication (530–8), Ne. does not actually help Phil. to rise from his knees or

offer assistance in walking to the ship; instead, he keeps his distance, speaking of Phil. in the third person (526 ὁρμάσθω ταχύς) and saying that ‘the ship will bring (him) and will not refuse’ (527), rather than addressing him directly in the second person and saying that he himself will take him from the island. Cf. Kosak 1999: 117–18.

468–70 πρὸς νῦν σε . . . ἰκνοῦμαι: Phil. speaks figuratively and does not actually kneel or reach for Ne.’s knees until 485–6. πρὸς νῦν σε πατρός: the word-order – enclitic σε between πρὸς and its gen. obj. – is normal in supplications, e.g. 1181–2 μῆ, πρὸς Ἀρκίου Διός, ἔλ- | θηίς, ἰκετεύω, *Tr.* 436 πρὸς σε τοῦ . . . Διός, *OC* 1333 πρὸς νῦν σε κρηνῶν. πρὸς τ’ εἴ τί σοι . . . ἰκνοῦμαι: the alliteration and assonance in thrice-repeated πρὸς τ(ε) + προσφιλές, the increasing length of the rhetorical units in 468–9, and the effectively brief and climactic 470 ἰκέτης ἰκνοῦμαι (with resolution, alliteration, and *figura etymologica*) heighten the emotional force with which Phil. begins his prayer. For the gen. of the person in the name of whom supplication is made, cf. 770, 1235.

470–1 μόνον | ἔρημον ‘alone, desolate’, cf. 227–8. Phil. refers to himself as ἔρημος at 227, 269, 471, 487, 1018, 1070 – all but the last in the acc. As he sees it, he has been transformed from a subject into an object by his abandonment. Similarly, he calls himself μόνος at 172, 227, 286, 470, and 954 – all but the last in the acc. Cf. 170–1, 195.

471–2 ἐν . . . ἐνναίοντά με ‘among such evils as you see and as many as you heard (me say) that I lived with’, including Phil.’s disease, his wretched dwelling in a cave, and his painful isolation. οἷσις, obj. of ὁρᾶις, is dat. by attraction; ὅσοισι τ’ is dat. with ἐνναίοντά με.

473–81 Phil. tries to persuade Ne. to bring him home in language strikingly similar to that used by Od. at 79–86, when he persuades Ne. to deceive Phil. Both speakers begin with a reassuring ξῖοιδα (79, 474); acknowledge Ne.’s inherent nobility (79 φύσει σε μὴ πεφυκότα / 475 τοῖσι γενναίοισι, cf. 50–1 δέῖ σε . . . γενναῖον εἶναι); encourage him to ‘bring himself’, ‘endure’, or ‘dare’ to do as urged (82 τόλμα / 481 τόλμησον); remind him that they need his help for only part of a single day (83 ἡμέρας μέρος βραχύ / 480 ἡμέρας . . . οὐχ ὅλης μᾶς); speak of the prize he will gain by doing as they say (81 κτήμα τῆς νίκης / 478 πλεῖστον εὐκλείας γέρας). The two passages ‘sum up . . . the two opposing influences at work on Ne.’ (Kirkwood 1958: 243–4n.23).

473 ἀλλ’ . . . θεῷ με: both ‘stow me away in a secondary part’ (of the ship, cf. 481), and ‘make me a matter of secondary concern’. Editors generally opt for either the literal or the figurative sense of ἐν παρέργῳ, but both are present. Cf. Pucci 218. For παρέργον (or plur. παρέργα) as something secondary or incidental, a ‘bywork’, cf. Eur. *El.* 509 ἦλθον γὰρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τάφον, παρέργ’ ὁδοῦ, Pl. *Rep.* 370c1 ἐν παρέργου μέρει.

473–4 δυσχέρεια . . . φορήματος ‘the disgust of (i.e. ‘caused by’) this cargo is great, I know’. Cf. 900 δυσχέρεια τοῦ νοσήματος. The most disgusting feature of Phil.’s disease, apart from the pain it causes, is the dreadful smell from the

unhealed wound (cf. 890–1 κακῇ / ὀσμῇ). Cf. *Kypria, Argumentum* (Bernabé 41 = West 2003: 76–7) Φιλοκτῆτης... διὰ τὴν δυσσομίαν ἐν Λήμνῳ κατελείφθη. At 482–3 and 889–92, Phil. anxiously mentions how offensive his disease will be for Ne.’s crew, when he is on the ship; at 519–20 Ne. warns them about their discomfort ‘when [they] are filled with the disease by being with it’. For φορηματός ‘cargo’, ‘freight’, cf. *Od.* 2.390 τὰ τε νῆες... φορέουσι. μὲν at first emphasizes δυσχέρεια, then is picked up in 475 by antithetical ὁμῶς δέ.

475–6 τοῖσι... εὐκλείης: τοῖσι γενναίοισι is both dat. of interest (‘for the noble’) and ethical dat. (‘in the eyes of the noble’). τοι gives Phil.’s words the flavour of a maxim, and the omission of (present) verb is also a feature of maxim-like sayings. εὐκλείης suggests ‘renown’ or ‘glory’ through song (cf. epic κλέος), not a private sense of honour. Elsewhere in Soph., εὐκλεία results or will result from extraordinary heroic action, e.g. 478, 1422, *Ant.* 502, 695, *El.* 973, 1083. In 477–9 Ne.’s εὐκλεία is contrasted to ὀνειδος, ‘blame’ or ‘reproach’ delivered publicly.

477 οὐ καλόν: litotes for κακόν, cf. *Tr.* 454.

478 πλεῖστον is used for μέγιστον, quantity for size, as the measure of an ‘honour-prize’.

479 ἐὰν μὲν ὧν ζῶν: for the prodelision, cf. 910 = *El.* 472 εἰ μὴ ὧν. ζῶν at position 6, agreeing with ὧν at position 5, the caesura, is emphatic: ‘if I come (home) *alive*...’

480 ἴθ’... μῆ: ἴθ’ conveys Phil.’s urgency (cf. 750, *OT* 1468–9). The word-order suggests ‘a day’s toil – not one whole day’s’, as Phil. qualifies his first assertion. From Lemnos to Skyros is c. 75 miles, and at 334 Ne. says the voyage from Skyros to Troy (c. 125 miles) took less than two days.

481 ἐμβαλοῦ μ’... ὅπως lit. ‘throw me wherever (in the ship) you wish, bringing (me)’. For the position and force of ὅπως, which in effect promises Phil.’s passivity, cf. 488, *OC* 910, 1342. There is a contrast between ‘bringing’ conceived of as durative and ‘throw’ conceived of as a single, complete act. The middle implies ‘throw me wherever it will be easiest for you’, anticipating ὅποι θέλεις. In late Greek ἐμβάλλεσθε can mean ‘put on board ship’, but this sense is not attested before the third-century BCE (LSJ s.v. ἐμβάλλω π.4).

482–3 ἐς ἀντλίαν... πρύμνην further defines 481 ὅποι θέλεις, which is then reinforced by 482–3 ὅποι... ἀलगυνεῖν. In 482 ὅπου might be expected and is actually found in some MSS, but ὅποι is correct, given the directionality inherent in ἐμβαλοῦ. Cf. *OC* 23 ὅποι καθέσταμεν with Jebb’s note. The *asyndeta* in listing the parts of the ship are a further sign of Phil.’s urgency. ἀντλίαν, ‘the place where bilge-water accumulates’, or possibly the bilge-water itself (cf. Ar. *Pax* 17–18), is the most uncomfortable of the options Phil. mentions, and it comes first, emphatically; then πρῶιραν and πρύμνην indicate the far ends of the ship and, like other such polar doublets, together signify ‘anywhere’. Elmsley’s πρύμνην for the unmetrical πρύμναν (in Attic the final α of πρύμνα is short) restores the epic–Ionic form normally used by Attic dramatists. (πρύμναν θ’, found in several MSS, is a more awkward metrical correction.) Cf. Ar. *Vesp.*

399 ἦν πως πρύμνην ἀνακρούσεται (where πρύμνην also is a correction by Elmsley).

484 νεῦσον: Phil. perhaps pauses after 483 to let his words sink in, then resumes by again urging Ne. to grant his prayer. In Greek, ancient and modern, (κατὰ)νεύω is ‘nod yes’, ἀνανεύω is ‘nod no’ or ‘refuse’.

485–6 πείσθητι . . . χωλός: πείσθητι is emphatic, owing to its position in enjambment, at the end of the sentence and the beginning of the line. The asyndeton in 485, the enjambment in 485–6 and 486–7, the unusual sentence-end at pos. 7 in 486, and the resolutions in 484–6 reflect Phil.’s agitated state of mind and urgent desire to convince Ne. to save him.

προσπίτνω . . . χωλός: Phil. moves from symbolic to physical supplication, perhaps literally going down on his knees (γόνασι is locative dat.), despite his painfully diseased foot (cf. Eur. *Pho.* 293 γονυπετείς ἔδρας προσπίτνω σ’). These words, however, also could mean ‘I am a suppliant at your knees’; cf. Eur. *Supp.* 9–10 αἶ . . . προσπίτνουσ’ ἐμὸν γόνυ, LSJ *s.v.* προσπίτνω III, Pucci 219. The epic and Ionic form γούνασι, found in most MSS, would require -ασι to form a resolved *anceps* syllable at position 9 of the trimeter (the *anceps* of the final metron), but elsewhere in Soph. resolution of heavy *anceps* at position 9 (*Ant.* 1180, *Tr.* 478, *OC* I, 1415) or position 5 (794, *Aj.* 1302, *OC* 317, 1320) occurs only in proper names. Cf. *Intro.*, p. 38. καίπερ . . . χωλός ‘although being the wretch who am powerless, lame’.

ἀλλά μή μ’ ἄφηις: ἀλλά strengthens the neg. command. Cf. 526n. **487** ἔρημον . . . οὕτω: cf. *Ant.* 773 ἄγων ἔρημος ἐνθ’ ἂν ἦι βροτῶν στίβος. On στίβος, cf. 2 ἄστιπτος with n.

488–96 ἔκσωσόν μ’ . . . μ’ ἐκῶσαι: the chiasmic repetition is emphatic and expresses Phil.’s extreme emotion. For him, ‘salvation’ is to return home, not to be cured of his disease. In beseeching Ne., as he besought his own father, to ‘save’ him, Phil. shows remarkable abjection.

489 Χαλκῶδοντος: Chalkodon was a Euboian king in Poias’ generation, the father of Elephenor, who commands the Abantes and other Euboian contingents at Troy and is killed by Agenor (*Il.* 2.536–41, 4.464). Chalkodon’s tomb, perhaps a cenotaph (see below), was on the northwest coast of Euboea, opposite Mt Oita across the Malian Gulf (Strabo 10.682; cf. 8.621). An Athenian audience might recall the story that Theseus was said to have sent his sons (cf. 562) to Chalkodon’s son Elephenor for protection, when he himself left Athens for Skyros (Plut. *Theseus* 35.5). Chalkodon was referred to, and may have been a character, in Soph.’s *Skyrioi*, cf. fr. 555b.15. τὰ . . . σταθμά: heteroclite plur. of ὁ σταθμός, denoting impermanent ‘rustic buildings for [temporarily] sheltering sheep and cattle and their minders’ (Chadwick 254), in contrast to 488 οἶκον τὸν σόν. Phil. says, in effect, If you can’t bring me to a real house, even makeshift animal shelters would do, since I will be on my way home.

490–2 κάκειθεν . . . φιλιῶι: κάκειθεν is crasis of καὶ ἐκεῖθεν. Trachis is the region between Mt Oita and the Malian gulf, through which the Spercheios River flows after skirting the Oitaian heights, here called Τραχινίαν . . . δεράδα (cf. *Hdt.*

7.198.1 Τρηχ(ν)ιαί πέτραι), which enclose the plain of Malis. In Greek epic εὔροος is an epithet of the swiftly flowing Skamandros (*Il.* 7.329, 21.130), though not of the Spercheios, but cf. Lucan, *Pharsalia* 6.366-7 *fert amne citato | Maliacas Sperchios aquas*. Cf. Aesch. fr. 249 (from *Philoktetes*) = Ar. *Ranae* 1383 Σπερχειῖ ποταμὲ βούνομοι τε ἐπιστροφαί, undoubtedly an apostrophe by Philoktetes to his native land. δέρας does not occur elsewhere, but Toup's δεράδα for δειράδα plausibly replaces an epic and Ionic form with an Attic one and eliminates a metrical anomaly: δειράδα would require ~ for ~ at position 7, a metrical anomaly which occurs elsewhere in Soph. only at fr. 314.128 (from *Ichneutai*), where the text is uncertain, and elsewhere in tragedy only in the name Ἀριόμαρδος at Aesch. *Pers.* 321 and perhaps in Ἰόνιος at Aesch. *PV* 840. ὥς δέλξει is a purpose clause dependent on 488 ἔκσωσόν με. Cf. *Aj.* 567-9 ὅπως... δέλξει. In both passages the sense seems to be 'show as a surprise' ('look who's here!'), with a deictic gesture.

493-4 δν... βεβήκη 'whom I have long since feared, lest he may have gone from me' (Jebb). παλαιόν ἐξότου (= παλαιόν ἐστι ἐξ οὗ 'it is long since when') is a parenthetical adv. phrase modifying δέδοικ'. Cf. *Aj.* 600-4 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ τλάμων παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος... εὐνῶμαι. βεβήκη is euphemistic for τεθνήκη (cf. 415) and gains emphasis by its position at sentence end and at the caesura. μοι is ethical dative.

494 πολλά... ἰγμένους: πολλά is adv. with ἔστελλον. τοῖς ἰγμένους refers to Phil.'s occasional visitors, cf. 305-11.

496 αὐτόστολον... δόμους 'that he, sailing with his own ship, save me (by bringing me) home'. πλεύσαντα is aor. participle, coincident in time with the main verb, cf. 913. With πέμψαντα, found in most MSS, the sense would be 'that he, escorting me with his own ship, save me...'. δόμους is acc. indicating the goal or 'end' of motion, a rare construction usually found only in lyric, e.g. 1175: *Ant.* 821-2 ζῶσα... | Αἶδην καταβήσῃ, *OC* 1769-70 Θήβας δ' ἡμᾶς | ... πέμψων. δόμοις, the reading of most MSS, is possible but less likely: it would either express the 'end' of motion (cf. *Ant.* 1236 ἤρεισε πλευραῖς μέσσον ἕγκος, *Tr.* 789-90 χροὶ | ῥίπτων ἑαυτόν, Campbell, *Essay* 18, §11.3) or be dat. of advantage ('save me for (the benefit) of his house').

497-9 ἀλλ'... στόλον 'but either he is dead or, as is likely, I think, the messengers, making my part of little account, hurried eagerly on their voyage homeward'. For 'my part' = 'me', see LSJ s.v. μέρος III.2. Parenthetical οἶμαι has 'a colloquial flavour' when, as here, it seems to express doubt but actually means 'no doubt'; 'of course' (Stevens 1976: 66-7, Collard 2005: 361); cf. fr. 583.4 (from *Troilus*) ἡδιστον, οἶμαι, ζῶμεν ἀνθρώπων βίον. τὰ... διακόνων... στόλον 'the messengers... hastened on their homeward voyage'. With a periphrastic subject, e.g. τὸ or τὰ with the genitive plural, a pred. participle agrees 'in number and gender with the real subject which is contained in the genitive' (*SCG* 1.55-6). τὰ τῶν διακόνων cannot be an adv. parenthesis, 'in the way of messengers', because the singular τὸ is always used in this construction, never the plural τὰ, e.g. Pl. *Phd.* 77d7 τὸ τῶν παιδῶν.

500–6 Phil. ends his speech by briefly reiterating his urgent appeal for ‘pity’ and ‘salvation’ and explaining, in terms of the human condition generally, why Ne. ought to do as he requests. 500–3 end with the kind of general maxim with which many speeches in Soph. conclude, but 504–6 are apt and in character for Phil., who omits no argument that might persuade Ne. to save him.

500–1 εἰς . . . ἦκω: as often, γάρ introduces a parenthetical explanation (GP 68–70). ἐλέω and ἐλεεινῶς, common in epic, occur in Soph. only in this play (308, 870, 967; cf. 1130 ἐλεινόν (also at *Tr.* 528, *OT* 672)), a reflection of its theme and epic diction (cf. Priam’s appeal to Achilles for pity at *Il.* 24.503–4). οἰκτίζω, οἰκτίρω, οἶκτος, οἰκτρός, and οἰκτρῶς, which together occur eleven times, also contribute to the theme of pity, but do not have the same, specifically epic implication that some action should or will follow as a consequence of the emotion (Pauscello 2010: 200–3, citing Burkert 1955: 42–3, Pohlenz 1956: 52). Here Phil. seeks ἔλεος, but receives οἶκτος (cf. 507 οἶκτιρ’); cf. 308 ἐλεούσι/309 οἰκτῖροντες, 318 ἐποικτῖρειν and 965 οἶκτος/967 ἔλεσον. The Chorus use οἶκτος language of Phil. at 169, 187, 318, 1167, as does Ne. at 965, 1074, but never ἔλεος language; see Pauscello 2010: 203n.25, *Introd.*, p. 19. σὺ μ’ ἐλέησον: the unusual ‘split’ resolution σὺ μ’ ἐ-, with two light syllables in different words, (cf. 1247 ἄ γ’ ἐ-), expresses Phil.’s urgency and emotion as he seeks pity that will be expressed in his salvation (σὺ σώσον).

501–3 εἰσορῶν . . . θάτερα ‘seeing that all things are full of terror and dangerously disposed for mortals to fare well or fare the other (i.e. ‘the opposite’) way’. For the form of opposition in which the latter option is more emphatic by contrast to the former, its rhetorical foil, cf. 345 εἴτ’ ἀληθές εἴτε . . . μάτην, *Ant.* 616–17 πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνασις ἀνδρῶν, πολλοῖς δ’ ἀπάτα.

504 χρῆ . . . ὀρᾶν ‘one must look out for terrible things, when he is (still) outside of troubles’. ὄντα agrees with an understood τινα, which like τις in the following line expresses ‘one’ or an imaginary ‘you’; cf. *OC* 1536–7 ὅταν . . . τις . . . εἰς τὸ μαίνεσθαι τραπήῃ. Cf. *Men. Epit.* 343–5 ὄντ’ ἐπισφαλῇ φύσει | τὸν βίον ἀπάντων τῇ προνοίᾳ δεῖ, πάτερ, | τηρεῖν, and, more generally, *Hdt.* 1.32.9: ‘one must consider the end of anything, how it will turn out; for the god, having offered prosperity to many, overthrows them radically and totally’.

506 μὴ . . . λάθῃ lit. ‘lest it escape (your) notice being destroyed’, i.e. ‘lest it be destroyed without your knowing it’. The subj. is βίος, understood from proleptic βίον in 505.

507–18 are the antistrophe corresponding to 391–402. Here too the lyric outburst occurs in place of an expected two-line response by the *korymbaios* to Phil.’s long *rhēsis* and is an attempt by the Chorus τὸ παρὸν θεραπεύειν (149). Probably Phil. remains on his knees (cf. 485–6) while the Chorus sing, and then through 529, at which point, to judge from the absence in the text of any indication that Ne. helps him to rise, he stands up without assistance before or as he speaks (530–2).

508–9 πόνων | ἄθλ’ ‘struggles consisting of toils’, a defining gen., cf. 104 ἰσχύος θράσος *Tr.* 505 ἀεθλ’ ἀγώνων. οἶα: the neut. plur. of prons. and

adjs. with *τυγχάνω* or *κυρέω* is probably internal acc. of respect (adverbial), not direct obj. Cf. *OT* 1298-9 *ὅς' ἐγὼ | προσέκυρσ'*, *OC* 1106 *αἰτεῖς & τεύξει*, Aesch. *Cho* 711 *τυγχάνειν τὰ πρόσφορα*, K-G 1.350 Anm. 9.

510-18 *εἰ... ἐκφυγών*: a mixed condition, in which the pres. indic. *ἔχθεις* in the protasis suggests 'if (as is the case) you hate...', while the opt. *πορεύσαιμ'* ἄν in the apodosis is more tentative. *ἐγὼ μὲν*: cf. 453n. *τὸ...*

μετατιθέμενος 'turning their evil (action) into profit for this man'. The middle indicates the personal interest of the Chorus (and by extension Ne.). The double acc. with *μετατιθῆμι* (-μαι) is unique, but the adv. force of *μετα-* allows the compound to be used with the construction of the simple verb. *εὐστόλου*

ταχείας: ships are regularly described by a pair of adjs. without *καί*, e.g. *Aj.* 710 *θοῶν ὠκυάλων νεῶν* and *Od.* 7.34 *νηυσὶ θεῆσι... ὠκείησι* (where the adjs. have basically the same meaning), and *Ant.* 954 *ἀλίκτυποι κελαινὰ νᾶες* and Aesch. *Supp.* 743 *δοριπαγείς... κυανωπίδας νῆας* (where they have different meanings). *τὰν... νέμεσιν*: cf. 484. Originally *νέμεσις* is the 'righteous anger' which injustice provokes in the gods. Personified, *Νέμεσις* is a divinity often associated with *Αἰδώς*, e.g. Hes. *Op.* 200, and *Δίκη*, cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 10.44 *ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν*. Here the Chorus, exploiting religious sentiment for their own advantage (cf. 391-402n.), disingenuously suggest that by bringing Phil. home, they will avoid the righteous anger of the gods that would result from their ignoring his supplication.

519-38 Ne. pretends to be puzzled or even annoyed by the Ch.'s enthusiastic lyric recommendation to bring Phil. home, almost as if he and they were working at cross purposes. He warns them that they may not understand the discomfort awaiting them, but when they assure him that they mean what they say, he declares that he will not be shamed by them and says, somewhat brusquely in the third-person imper., 'Let (Phil.) set forth fast' (526 *ὀρμάσθω τάχως*). Ne's prayer to the gods to 'save us from this land to where we wish to sail' (528-9) is equivocal: Phil. assumes that the destination is home, while Ne. is no doubt thinking of Troy. Phil. is overjoyed at the apparent success of his supplication and invites Ne., before they depart, to visit his 'dwelling that is no dwelling' (534) and learn how he has survived.

519-21 *ὄρα... φανῆις* 'see to it lest now you may be an easygoing (bystander) (τις εὐχερής), but when you are filled with the disease by being with it, then you may appear no longer the same as these words'. As usual, a verb meaning 'see to it' or 'be on guard against' takes the construction of a verb of fearing in a neg. obj. clause. Cf. *OC* 1180 *μή σοι πρόνοι'* *ἦ... φυλακτέα*, Smyth §2210b, *GMT* §354. *μή* goes with both *παρῆις* and *φανῆις*, and *εὐχερής* is in pointed contrast to 473 *δυσχέρεια*. The series of monosyllables in 519 suggests Ne.'s tentativeness and hesitation; *τις* with a pred. nom. is disparaging, cf. Aesch. *PV* 696 *καὶ πλέα φόβου τις εἴ. σὺ* is emphatic by its anticipatory position early in the sentence and in the *μή* clause of which it is the subj. *τῆς νόσου*

is governed by *πλησθῆις*, and *ξυνουσία* is causal dat.; cf. 758-9 *πλάνοις... ὥς*

ἐξεπλήσθη, *OC* 63 τῇ ξυνουσίαι πλέον. αὐτὸς τοῖς λόγοις ‘the same in (your) words (i.e. ‘the same as in the words you spoke just now’)’. αὐτός is crasis of ὁ αὐτός, and τοῖς λόγοις is dat. of respect. For ‘the same’ meaning ‘the same as before’, ‘unchanged’, ‘consistent’, cf. *OT* 557 αὐτός εἰμι τῷ βουλευμάτι, Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 920, Gibert 1995: 19–20 with n. 15.

522–3 ἥκιστα... ὀνειδίσαι: ἥκιστα ‘not at all’ is a colloquial touch, e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 316, 380, *Av.* 126, Stevens 1976: 14. Taken together, the assertive οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅπως ποτ’ (cf. 196.), the *hyperbaton* (τοῦτο... τοῦνιδος), and the cognate acc. construction τοῦνιδος... ὀνειδίσαι are strongly emphatic.

524–5 ἀλλ’... πονεῖν lit. ‘but it (would be) shameful that I appear to the stranger more lacking than *you* in regard to toiling as is most opportune (for him)’. Cf. *Aj.* 38 πρὸς καιρὸν πονῶ; ‘do I toil as is opportune?’ πονεῖν is expegetical inf., dependent on ἐνδέεστερον, and despite the word-order, might also be felt with ξένωι ‘to toil for a stranger’. ἀλλ’... μέντοι marks the (seeming) reluctance with which Ne. assents to the Chorus’ plea. Cf. *Aj.* 1370, where the same sequence of particles introduces Agamemnon’s grudging consent to have Ajax buried, as *Od.* has urged.

526 ἀλλ’... πλέωμεν: ἀλλά with an imperative or hortatory subjunct. frequently strengthens the command or exhortation, cf. 486, *Tr.* 492; cf. *GP* 13–15. With εἰ δοκεῖ, Ne. places the responsibility for his decision on the Chorus. Ne. uses these same words with a verb of going (from the island) also at 645 and 1402; each time the departure is interrupted, first by the entrance of the FM (542), then by Phil.’s paroxysm (732), and finally by the intervention of Herakles (1409). ὀρμάσθω ταχύς: Ne. does not respond directly to Phil.’s supplication, and his third-person command is curt and somewhat cruel, given Phil.’s inability to move at all easily (see 290–2); cf. 1080 ὀρμαῖσθα ταχεῖς. Greek often uses a pred. adj. denoting degree, mental attitude, or manner where English would have an adv., e.g. 808 ὀξεῖα φοιτᾷ καὶ ταχεῖ’ ἀπέρχεται, Smyth §1043.

527 χή... ἀπαρνηθήσεται ‘for her part the ship will bring him and will not refuse’. There is no classical parallel for the deponent fut. pass., but since the deponent aor. pass. of ἀρνούμαι, ἡρνήθη, is frequent in classical Attic (as is the aor. mid. ἡρνησάμην), the deponent fut. pass. in a compound is clearly possible. For the personification of ναῦς, cf. *Od.* 10.131–2 ἀσπασίως δ’ ἐς πόντον ἐπηρεφέας φύγε πέτρας | νηῦς, Arist. *Pol.* 3.13.16 οὐ γὰρ ἐθέλειν αὐτὸν [*sc.* Ἡρακλῆ] ἀγειν τὴν Ἀργώ.

528–9 μόνον... πλεῖν: Ne., without actually lying, concludes on an equivocal note. μόνον ‘only’ (cf. Lat. *modo*), is frequent in wishes or commands, e.g. *Tr.* 596, 1109. βουλοίμεσθα in the rel. clause is attracted into the opt., after σῶιζοιεν in the main clause, cf. 324–5 γένοιτο... γνοῖεν with n. ἡμᾶς is placed between the parallel (τε... τ’...) adverbial phrases.

530–8 Phil. rises to his feet (cf. 507–18n.) as (or just before) he bursts forth in expressions of joy and friendship, then invites Ne. to visit his ‘dwelling that is no dwelling’, so that he may see for himself how Phil. survived. He does not

know that Ne. has already been in the cave (31–9). Some scholars think Ne. must help Phil. to rise, in accordance with the norms of ritual supplication and of the establishment of ξενία (e.g. Belfiore 1994: 120), but Ne. does not assist Phil. in this way until 894–7, at the key moment of reversal in the dramatic action.

530–1 ὦ...ναῦται: as much an exclamation as a direct address.

531–2 πῶς...προσφιλή 'I wish I could be manifest to you in action (not only in speech) how you have made me friendly to (you)!' Cf. 794–5 with 793–5n. Sometimes editors punctuate such wishes as questions rather than exclamations, e.g. *Aj.* 388–91 πῶς ἂν...θάνοιμι καὶ τός;, *OT* 765 πῶς ἂν μόλοι...πάλιν; Cf. Dawe on *OT* 765, Moorhouse 231, K–G 1: 235. It is, however, unclear whether Soph.'s audience would have distinguished between the two.

533–4 ἴωμεν...εἰσοίκησιν 'let us go (from the island)...after the two of us have done reverence to my dwelling that is no dwelling', i.e. to my 'house' that is not a 'home' both because it is a rocky cave rather than a product of human construction and because it lacks the defining feature of an οἶκος, the household cults of Ζεὺς ἑρκείος and the πατρῶιοι θεοί. προσκύσαντες: προσκυνέω originally meant 'prostrate oneself before a (statue of a) god or a king as a sign of obeisance and respect, while kissing his hands or feet' (cf. κυνέω 'kiss'). It also was used of worshipping or greeting divinities, natural phenomena (e.g. the sun) and places or things associated with divinity; cf. 657, 776, *OC* 1654–5 ὁρώμεν αὐτὸν γῆν τε προσκυνούνθ' ἅμα | καὶ τὸν θεῶν Ὀλυμπον ἐν ταυτῷ λόγῳ. Phil. implies that the earth within the cave is such a place and deserves the farewell gesture of respect and gratitude that would be due to a god. His use of the dual, expressing joyful solidarity with Ne. (cf. 530), in effect competes with Od.'s duals at 25, 133. Cf. 25n., 1434–7n. εἰσοίκησιν occurs only here and is a good example of Soph.'s predilection for -σις nouns, some undoubtedly of his own coinage (Long 1968: 33–4, cf. *Introd.*, p. 32).

534 ὥς με καὶ μάθῃς is a purpose clause dependent on the idea of movement into the cave in προσκυσάντες...εἰσοίκησιν. Cf. 48 with n.

535–8 ἄφ'...εὐκάρδιος 'from what (i.e. 'with what') I continued to stay (διὰ-) alive and how I am by nature stout-hearted'. Cf. the force of ἀπό in Thuc. 1.2.2 ἀπόζην. εὐκάρδιος, a rare and elevated word (cf. *Aj.* 364, Eur. *Hec.* 579), suggests Phil.'s consciousness of his distinctive heroic nature, which is explained more fully in 536–8 (Pucci 227). Cf. *Od.* 20.18 τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη.

536–8 οἶμαι...κακά lit. 'for I think that not another man except me, had he ever grasped the sight alone with his eyes, would have endured these things; but I, by necessity, gradually learned to embrace (my) evils'. These lines explain 535 εὐκάρδιος and indicate Phil.'s sense of his own, special heroism; cf. *OT* 1414–15 τάμ' γὰρ κακά | οὐδεὶς οἶός τε πλὴν ἐμοῦ φέρειν βροτῶν. For the force of πρό in προὔμαθον 'learned gradually', cf. 1015 προὔδιδαςεν, which implies

gradual teaching. *δμμασιν θέαν* . . . *λαβόντα* is a forceful periphrasis for *ἰδόντα* or *θεασάμενον* (cf. 656 *θέαν λαβεῖν*).

539–41 *ἐπίσχετον* . . . *εἰσιτον*: as Ne. and Phil. move toward the cave, the Chorus-Leader alerts them to the approach of two men along the same *εἰσόδος* by which Ne. and Od. originally entered. One is a sailor from Ne.'s ship, the other, apparently a stranger but actually the *σκοπός* of the Prologue – the man Od. said he would send back disguised a merchant ship's captain, if Ne. seemed to be taking too long a time (125–9). The FM, however, would not have been played by the mute actor of the Prologue but by the tritagonist, who also plays Od. and Her. The duals *ἐπίσχετον* and *εἰσιτον* refer to Ne. and Phil., as the Chorus strategically follow Phil.'s lead in 533 and speak of the pair in the dual as if they belonged together naturally (Hahnemann 2011). Cf. the FM's *σφῶν* at 627, which, however, could be taken in multiple ways, cf. 627n. *ἔνδρε* . . . *δύο* and indic. *χωρεῖτον* refer to the two men who are approaching.

539 *ἐπίσχετον* . . . *μάθωμεν*: for the shift with asyndeton from second-person imper. to first-person subjunct., cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 567 *ἐπίσχετ'* . . . *ἐκμάθω*, *Her.* 1059 *σίγα* . . . *μάθω*.

540 *ἀλλόθρους* lit. 'of foreign speech', but referring to the stranger's foreign appearance, as if it were *ἀλλότριος*. Cf. *Tr.* 844–5 *ἄπ' ἀλλόθρου | γνώμας*.

541 *χωρεῖτον, ὧν μαθόντες*: cf. 370 *πρὶν μαθεῖν ἐμοῦ*. Here as in 539, *μαθῶντω* means 'learn' rather than 'understand', its usual sense when used absolutely or with a gen. referring to a person. For dual and plur. referring to the same persons, an epicism, cf. *OT* 1511–12 *εἰχέτον* . . . *εὐχεσθέ μοι*, *OC* 342–3 *σφῶν* . . . *οἰκουροῦσιν*.

542–627 The False Merchant scene. When, at 539–41, the Chorus announce that they see two men approaching, one a sailor from Ne.'s ship and the other a stranger, the audience would immediately assume that the stranger is the *σκοπός* ('look-out') last seen in the Prologue. Od. had said that he would send this man again in disguise, 'so that *ἄγνοια* may be present' (cf. 127–9), and *ἄγνοια* – both the FM's 'unrecognizability' and Phil.'s 'ignorance' (cf. 129n.) – pervades the entire scene (Budelmann 2000: 54–5). Od. had told Ne. to 'receive what is advantageous in [the FM's] words from time to time, as he speaks craftily' (130–1, cf. 130–1n.). This would predispose Ne., as well as the audience, to pay careful attention to what the FM says and how he says it. The FM, played by the same actor who played Od. and will later play Her., is in effect a false messenger, like Ne. in 343–90 or the Paidagogos in *El.* 680–763. He aims to deceive, unlike most tragic messengers who convey information in a truthful speech that enables listeners to grasp a reality previously unknown to them (Payne 2000: 403, 412–18, Barrett 2002: 23–6). In a sense, the FM, like Ne., is a character in a play within the play authored and directed by Od. Also like Ne. (and the Paidagogos in *El.*), his role involves both prepared speech and an element of improvisation. He adds persuasive and corroborative detail by alluding to the *Il.*, to other

mythology familiar from the epic cycle, and to earlier dramatizations of the story of Philoktetes, blending familiar, canonical details with artful innovations. The scene signals its metatheatrical quality most overtly at those moments when the words of the FM and of Ne. have different meanings for different listeners (e.g. 580-1, 589-90). This ironic play with the dramatic medium is not gratuitous but directly related to major themes of the drama, such as friendship and betrayal, truth and falsehood, deception and persuasion, ends and means. One major problem for at least some members of a fifth-century Athenian audience (and many readers today) is to what degree they can take at face value information from a bogus character whose words are scripted by Od. Some features of the FM's speech might seem false, as when he departs radically from all known mythological traditions and says that Phoinix and the sons of Theseus have gone in pursuit of Ne. (561-2), while Od. and Diomedes are on their way to take Phil. and bring him back to Troy (570-1, 591-4). The account of Helenos' prophecy (604-13) might seem at least generally true, since Helenos' capture by Od. and prophecy were part of the mythological tradition (cf. *Little Iliad*, *Argumentum*, Bernabé 74 = West 2003: 120-1), as was the 'fact' that Troy did fall to the Greeks and that Phil., wielding Herakles' bow, and Ne. played significant roles in the sack of the city. The crucial detail in the prophecy, that the Greeks will never sack Troy, unless they bring Phil. from Lemnos by means of persuasion (610-13), seems to contradict Od.'s categorical statement in the Prologue that he cannot be brought by persuasion (102-3); it probably would have puzzled many listeners, as would the FM's mythological innovations and his unconventional diction and style at certain key moments (e.g. 591-4, 598-9). The FM not only challenges Ne. and Phil. to make sense of the 'information' he provides, but invites audiences and readers to interpret the complex scene, while making it impossible for them to do so with certainty. Cf. Østerud 1973, Greengard 1987: 24-7, Easterling 1997b: 169-70, Falkner 1998: 435-6, 442, Payne 2000: 412-18, Budelmann 2000: 113-22, Encinas Reguero 2011: 91-4.

542-56 At comparable moments in *Tr.* and *OT*, after one messenger has spoken and prior to the entrance of a second messenger, the Chorus sing a song of hopeful expectation (*Tr.* 224-495, *OT* 1086-1109). Here, however, the Chorus do not share Phil.'s anxiety, uncertainty, and hopes, as they share those of Deianeira and Oidipous (Payne 2000: 414-15). Instead, the FM enters, accompanied by one of Ne.'s sailors, and in a laboured speech, consisting of three awkward sentences, identifies himself, explains his presence, and gives a reason for going out of his way to tell Ne. the 'new plans' about him that are 'not only plans but actions being carried out' (554-6, cf. 567).

542 τόνδε implies a gesture toward the sailor from Ne.'s ship, a κωπὸν πρόσωπον, who has supposedly led the FM to Ne.

544 ἐμοί σε . . . φράσαι 'to point you out to me, where you might be'. Proleptic σε is obj. of φράσαι and anticipatory subj. of the indir. question ποῦ κυρῶν

εἴης, cf. 444 with n., 534–5, 549–50, 573–4. Finite verb + suppl. part. κυρῶν (cf. 741) is less common than a finite form of κυρέω + suppl. part., e.g. 371 ὦν κυρεῖ, 443 εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ.

545–6 ἐπείπερ . . . πέδον: with ἀντέκυσσα, sc. σοι ‘since I have encountered you’; cf. *OC* 1679–80 δῶτι μὴτ’ Ἄρης | μῆτε πόντος ἀντέκυσεν. There is a double contrast: (1) between aorist ἀντέκυσσα, used of a completed action, and pres. part. δοξάζων with imperf. force (= δτε ἐδόξαζον); cf. *OT* 1457 θνήσκων ἐσώθη; (2) between (supposed) δοξάζων μὲν οὐ and (supposed) τύχηι δὲ . . . πέδον ‘by fortune somehow having come to anchor in the same land’. ταῦτόν . . . πέδον is acc. denoting the ‘end of motion’ implicit in ὀρμισθεῖς. In prose, a preposition would be needed, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.18 πρὸς τὴν γῆν ὀρμισθεῖς. πέδον can denote ‘land’ generally or, as here, a particular place, cf. *LSJ* s.v. 1, 2. If – as is likely – τύχηι means ‘by (random) chance’, then τύχηι . . . πέδον is a clear lie, like δοξάζων μὲν οὐ. It would not necessarily be a lie if τύχηι meant ‘by good fortune’ or ‘by Fate’.

547 οὐ πολλῶι στόλῳ ‘with no great equipage’, i.e. with a single, small (merchant) ship and a small crew. Cf. *Tr.* 496 σὺν πολλῶι στόλῳ with Easterling’s note.

548–9 τὴν . . . Πεπάρηθον: an island c. twenty miles NE of Euboea and c. forty miles NW of Skyros, famous for its wine, cf. Eur. fr. 752a1–2 (from *Hypsipyle*). An audience familiar with the *Iliad* might recall 7.467–75, the account of the Greek army at Troy importing wine from Lemnos. This Iliadic allusion provides a kind of support for the FM’s story by reference to a mythological detail ‘known’ to the audience, though it is not a detail with which Phil. and Ne., as dramatic characters, could have been familiar. Cf. the Iliadic echoes in the Paidagogos’ story of the chariot race at *El.* 680–763, Easterling 1997b: 169.

549–50 ὡς . . . συννεναυστοληκότες ‘when I heard that the sailors had all made the voyage with you’ (i.e. that they ‘were all members of your crew’). With οἱ νενναυστοληκότες, the reading of the MSS, σοί would be dat. of possession (‘that all those who had made the voyage were your men’). τοὺς ναύτας is obj. of ἤκουσα and proleptic subj. of εἴεν συννεναυστοληκότες, cf. 544n., and σοί is governed by συν-. ἤκουσα is followed by ind. discourse with a ὅτι clause rather than a participle, because it denotes intellectual rather than purely physical perception (cf. Smyth §2110).

551–2 ἐδοξέ μοι . . . ἴσων lit. ‘it seemed best to me not to make (my) voyage in silence, before I should tell you (my news), having obtained (in return) a fair (reward)’. πρίν + opt. without ἔν is used in indir. discourse after a *negative* verb in past time. In dir. statement the construction would be πρίν + subjunct. (here, πρίν φράσω); sometimes the subjunct. is used even in indir. discourse for the sake of vividness, e.g. *Aj.* 741–2 τὸν ἄνδρ’ ἀπηύδα Τεῦκρος ἐνδόθεν στέγης | μὴ ᾿ξω παρῆναι, πρίν παρὼν αὐτὸς τύχηι. Cf. *GMT* §644, Moorhouse 299, K–G II: 456. προστυχόντι agrees with 551 μοι and is structurally parallel

to 551 πρὶν φράσαιμι, which is more emphatic than φράσαντι would be. This is preferable to taking προστυχόντι as agreeing with 551 σοί ('after you have received what is fair'), especially because Ne. responds to the FM with a promise of his gratitude (557–8). Other tragic messengers also ask, or expect, to be rewarded for their news, e.g. *Tr.* 190–1, *OT* 1005–6.

553 οὐδὲν . . . περὶ 'you doubtless know nothing of the things concerning yourself'. The asyndeton reflects the (supposed) urgency for Ne. of the FM's news. For the accent on περὶ (anastrophe), see 6n.

554–5 ἄ . . . ἐστὶ 'the new plans which the Argives have about you'. ἄ precedes its antecedent, νέα | βουλευματα, introducing a relative clause that explains those βουλευματα. νέα (cf. 560n.) gains emphasis as the final word of the line and from the enjambment in which it looks forward to 555 βουλευματ' ἐστὶ. βουλευματα denotes both the Argives' 'purpose' and their '(political) resolution' as a community; cf. Aesch. *PV* 170 τὸ νέον βούλευμα (of the 'purpose' of Zeus), Thuc. 8.76.6 βούλευμα χρηστὸν (referring to a resolution of the Athenian government, cf. Greenwood 2006: 103–4).

555–6 κοῦ . . . ἐξαργούμενα: the repetition of βουλευματα helps to convey the significance for Ne. of the FM's report, as does the doubly emphatic 'deeds being enacted, no longer left undone'. Cf. *OT* 287 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἐπραξάμην (or ἐπράξαμεν).

557–8 ἀλλ' . . . μενεῖ 'the favour of (your) forethought, unless I am by nature bad and ignoble, will remain well-pleasing (to me)'. ἀλλ' introduces 'a sympathetic reaction to the previous speaker's words or actions' (*GP* 19), cf. 232, 336, 882. Given the reciprocity inherent in the notion of χάρις, ἡ χάρις . . . τῆς προμηθείας . . . προσφιλῆς suggests both (1) 'the favour consisting of (or conveyed by) your forethought . . . well disposed (toward me)', with τῆς προμηθείας understood as gen. of definition, a construction often associated with expressions of feeling (cf. Moorhouse 70–1), and (2) 'my gratitude for your forethought . . . well-disposed (toward you)', with τῆς προμηθείας understood as obj. gen.

559 φράσον . . . ἔλεξας 'but say just (γε) what you meant'. Emphatic γε after a relative is rare, but cf. Eur. *El.* 911 ἃ γ' εἰπεῖν ἦθελον, *Ion* 942 ἃ γ' ἠισθόμην.

560 νεώτερον can suggest something disturbing or even calamitous. Cf. 51–3n., 554 νέα with 554–5n., and the idiom νεώτερα πράγματα = 'revolution'. Here Ne. speaks with confident irony ('tell me what new plan on the part of the Argives is (so) calamitous for me'). The effect is heightened by quasi-middle caesura, barely softened by elision, which lends emphasis to βούλευμ', on which ἀπ' Ἀργείων depends.

561–2 φροῦδοι . . . κόροι: understand εἰσὶ with φροῦδοι. The two sons of Theseus, Akamas and Demophon, are not mentioned in the *Il.* or *Od.*, but in the Cyclic *Ἰλίου Πέρις* they were among the warriors hidden in the wooden horse (Paus. 1.23.8). Perhaps they are mentioned here as enemies of Ne., because his maternal grandfather Lykomedes (cf. 243) killed their father in Skyros (Paus. 1.17.6). Spectators and readers familiar with the mythological tradition might

well notice the FM's departure from the account in the *Little Iliad*, according to which Od. brought Ne. from Skyros to Troy (Introd., p. 23). Φοίνιξ: cf. 344ⁿ.

563 ὥς... ἄξοντες: Ne.'s question is part of the deceit: Od. told Ne. that he was needed to bring Phil. to Troy, because neither force nor persuasion would work (cf. 101–7). The question leads Phil. to expect a direct physical assault, just as the FM leads him to expect either persuasion or force (cf. 594, 610–13). ἄξοντες is fut. part. of purpose. For ἐκ... βίαις, cf. 314–15ⁿ, 945.

565 ἡ... δὴ introduces a question expressing 'lively surprise' (Jebb), cf. *El.* 385 ἡ ταῦτα δὴ με καὶ βεβούλευνται ποεῖν; In both passages δὴ after ταῦτα is slightly contemptuous (*GP* 208).

566 οὕτω... δρώσιν refers back to 561 φροῦδοι... διώκοντες. Ἀτρεΐδων: Ne. had referred to the 'Argives' in 560, but now he speaks of the 'sons of Atreus', his putative enemies (and Phil.'s), cf. 389–90.

567 ὥς... ἔτι 'know that these things are being done, no longer being delayed'. The FM repeats, in slightly different language, the sense of 556, cf. 1256. Normally after an imperative expressing (re)assurance, ὥς either is followed immediately by a participle, with or without μή, e.g. 253 ὥς μηδὲν εἰδότε ἴσθι μ', 415 ὥς μηκέτ' ὄντα... νόει, or introduces the whole sentence, e.g. 117 ὥς τοῦτο γ' ἔρξας δύο φέρημι δωρήματα, where an initial 'know' is understood. 567 in effect combines these two constructions.

568–9 πῶς... ἐτοίμος 'how, then, was Odysseus not ready to sail as his own messenger for this purpose'? πρὸς τάδε 'for this purpose' (cf. *OT* 766 πρὸς τί) could also mean 'in view of this' or 'in regard to this' (cf. *OT* 426 πρὸς ταῦτα), but this connective sense would perhaps be redundant after οὖν. αὐτάγγελος picks up 564 ἄγγελος and may suggest a hint of unease on Ne.'s part.

570–1 κείνός γ'... ἐγώ: γ' gives a slightly contemptuous emphasis to κείνος: 'oh him, he and the son of Tydeus...'. For ἐξανηγόμεν, cf. 355–6ⁿ; for intransitive στέλλω, cf. 640. The FM's vague ἄλλον ἄνδρα calculatedly creates more suspense than if he were to mention Phil. by name. In Eur. *Philoctetes* (431 BCE), the son of Tydeus (Diomedes), accompanies Od. to Lemnos to bring Phil. back to Troy. In the *Little Iliad*, Diomedes alone brings Phil., while Od. fetches Ne. from Skyros. See *Argumentum* 1 in Bernabé 74; West 2003: 120–1, 122–3. Cf. 561–2ⁿ.

572 πρὸς... ἐπλεῖ 'who *was* this man for whom Od. himself was sailing'? πρὸς ποῖον τόνδε = ποῖος ἦν ὃδε πρὸς ὃν, cf. 441. αὖ is frequently used in questions expressing impatience, like initial 'so' in English; it is best translated by enhanced vocal intensity: 'who *was* this man...'? αὖ is more idiomatic and more forceful than ἄν, the reading of the MSS, which would go either with ἐπλεῖ in a past potential construction or, possibly, with an understood ὄντα in agreement with ποῖον... τόνδε. αὐτός suggests that the man was important enough to the Greek army to require Od.'s personal presence, cf. 568 αὐτάγγελος. Οὐδυσσεύς is crasis of ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς.

573–4 ἦν δὴ τις – ἀλλά...: the FM begins as if he were going to say, ‘There was (in the army) a certain Philoktetes’, before going on to tell his story, but he interrupts himself with a conspicuous anacolouthon (and probable change to a stage whisper) calculated to pique Phil.’s curiosity, even though the FM pretends not to know to whom he is speaking. Cf. *Il.* 5.9 ἦν δὲ τις ἐν Τρώεσσι Δάρης, Xen. *An.* 3.14 ἦν δὲ τις ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος. δὴ regularly precedes indefinite pronouns, when the speaker cannot or does not bother to be specific, or when, as here, the speaker has a particular person in mind but prefers, at least at first, not to name that person (cf. *GP* 212–13, Collard on Eur. *Supp.* 968–70). τόνδε is proleptic obj. of φράσον (cf. 444n.), picked up by τις ἐστιν. ἄν... δέ: ἄν is crasis of ἄ ἄν. δέ, as the third (instead of second) word in its clause, is unusually pointed: ‘but whatever you say...’.

575 δδ’... ξένε: Ne. does not speak softly, but aloud and rather grandly. His use of the heroic κλεινός appeals strategically to Phil.’s sense of self (cf. 261–3) and further gains his approval, sympathy, and trust. σοι is ethical dat. (‘you can see before you’, ‘you should know’), cf. 261. ξένε distances Ne. from the FM for Phil.’s benefit.

576–7 μὴ... γῆς: the FM continues to speak in a low voice. For ὅσον τάχος ‘with as much speed as possible’, cf. *Aj.* 985–6 οὐχ ὅσον τάχος | δῆτ’ αὐτὸν ἄξεις δεῦρο...; τάχος is often used for ταχέως in adv. phrases and with relatives; with ὅσον, ὅτι, and ὥς, τάχος often = τάχιστα. σεαυτὸν συλλαβών ‘packing yourself off’ (LSJ *s.v.* συλλαμβάνω 1.2) is colloquial, a manner of speaking in keeping with a merchant’s low social status. Cf. *Ar. Av.* 1469 ἀπίωμεν ἡμεῖς συλλαβόντες τὰ πτερὰ, Stevens 1976: 13n.37, Collard 2005: 370. συλλαβών sometimes expresses scorn or contempt, as in *OT* 971, *OC* 1384; here it merely characterizes the FM as urgent.

578–9 τί φησιν... ναυβάτης: Phil. cannot contain himself and fears the worst, as the FM continues to whisper to Ne. His anxiety and urgency are shown by his repeated τί questions and reflected in the resolution in 578. τί με... διεμπολᾷ... πρὸς σ’ ‘what mercantile bargain is he making with you about me’, i.e. ‘Why is he treating me like merchandise?’ Cf. 978, *Ant.* 1035–6 (Kreon’s irrational claim to Teiresias that he has been ‘sold (ἐξημπολόημαι) and traded by your race [of prophets]’), and fr. 583.7 from *Tereus* (Prokne’s description of how ‘we [women] are pushed out [of the house] and bartered (διεμπολήμεθα)’ *sc.* in marriage). Phil. derives his metaphor from the FM’s occupation and his own fear, not from any knowledge that the FM is Od.’s agent, but the metaphor applies to Od. as well as to the FM: at 111, Od. says that κέρδος ‘profit’ as an end justifies lying as a means, and Od. is associated with this word and sentiment from Homer onward, e.g. *Il.* 4.339, 23.709, *Od.* 13.297, 299, 19.285–6. τοῦσδε

581 ἐς φῶς ‘openly’, in contrast to 578 κατὰ σκότον ‘secretly’.

582–8 The play within the play continues, as the FM beseeches Ne. not to accuse him to the Greek army, on whom he depends economically. Ne. responds

that Phil. is his ‘great friend’, with whom he shares a hatred of the sons of Atreus, and that if the FM really has come in friendship, he must not conceal anything he knows.

ὥ σπέρμ’ Ἀχιλλέως: cf. 364, where this phrase also precedes a denial. For the dat. with διαβάλλω, cf. Eur. *Hec.* 863 Ἀχαιοὶς εἰ διαβληθήσομαι. In prose the usual construction is διαβάλλειν πρὸς or ἐπὶ τινα.

583 λέγονθ’ ἃ μὴ δεῖ (as) saying what (i.e. ‘the sort of thing that’) must not (be said), with ‘generic’ μὴ rather than οὐ because ἃ μὴ δεῖ refers to a general category. Cf. Smyth §2705d.

583–4 πολλ’ . . . πένης ‘I receive many benefits from them in return for what I do (for them), such as a poor man would’. The gen. of personal agency with ὑπὸ (for the recessive accent here, see 6n.) indicates that ἀντιπάσχω is functionally passive, as πάσχω regularly is. Σ takes οἱ ἄνθρωποι πένης as obj. of δρῶν, but it also is felt with ἀντιπάσχω χρηστὰ (‘I receive benefits such as a poor man [would receive]’). Cf. 273 οἷα φωτὶ δυσμόρῳ.

585–8 ἐγὼ . . . ἀκήκοας: Ne. ‘protest[s] too much’, gesturing dramatically toward Phil. (οὔτος), his ‘greatest friend’ because he shares Ne.’s hatred of the Atreidai. Ne. insists that if the FM comes in friendship, he must tell them all he has heard concerning them. δεῖ . . . λόγων κρύψαι . . . μηδέν’ picks up 583 λέγονθ’ ἃ μὴ δεῖ. In effect, Ne. forces the FM to choose between being a ‘friend’ to himself and Phil., in order to profit by telling them his news fully (cf. 557–8), and his ‘friendship’ with the Greek army that allows him to profit as a trader (583–4). **ἐγὼ εἰμύ:** the synzesis of ω and εἰ is unique in extant tragedy, hence the variants in some MSS. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1224 ἐγὼ εἴσομαι, where ω and εἰ must be pronounced as one syllable. **σ’ . . . προσφιλή** ‘that you, if you have come in friendship toward me’. Cf. 361 ἐλθὼν . . . προσφιλῶς. **μηδέν’** goes with 587 λόγων (partitive gen.): ‘not a word (of what you have heard)’, which might recall Od.’s sinister use of λόγος and λέγων in 55; cf. 345, 352, 407–8, 1268–9.

589–90 The *antilabē* expresses feigned excitement and urgency, as Ne. and the FM play their parts in a scenario designed to impress Phil. In 589 the FM’s pretended emotion is intensified, when he ends his words with emphatic ποῖ at position 6, rhetorically bisecting the trimeter, despite ποιεῖς at the caesura. There are at least three levels of communication in the FM’s ὅρα τί ποιεῖς: Ne. would hear it as a message from Od. (and the FM himself), warning him to play his part in the intrigue carefully; Phil. would hear it as a sign of danger and understand that Ne. is on his side and willing to run risks for his sake; the audience would hear it as a warning that Ne. ‘must watch what he is doing’ morally. Ne.’s response, σκοπῶ κἀγὼ πάλαί, might mean, to the FM, ‘I am doing what Od. told me to do and playing my part’, but Phil. would hear it as a kind of defiance of the FM’s warning, while the audience could take it as a sign that Ne. is feeling some doubts about his role in deceiving Phil. Cf. 806, 906, 913, 966 (with 965–6n.), all with πάλαί; cf. Easterling 1997b: 170.

590 ποιοῦ λέγων ‘do so, but speak’ (Jebb). For the emphatic participle, cf. OC 1038 χωρὼν ἀπειλεῖ νῦν ‘threaten, but go on’.

591-7 As the FM 'breaks' under (supposed) pressure from Ne. and delivers the first part of his news, his sentences 'become longer and more flowing' (Budelmann 2000: 117), anticipating his longer speech in 603-21 and perhaps indicating that these longer units should be thought of by the audience as 'rehearsed'. 591 λέγω picks up 590 λέγων, an effect common in stichomythia. Cf. 'without the pretence) *Tr.* 1129-30 λέγ' . . . | λέγω.

591 'πὶ τοῦτον is particularly emphatic because of the unusual *aphaeresis* of ἐ- after sentence end; cf. Eur. *IA* 719 μέλλω 'πὶ ταύτῃ καὶ καθέσταμεν τύχῃ τοῦτον instead of τόνδε (cf. 572) suggests that here the FM acts as if he is not particularly interested in Phil., but is concerned only to satisfy Ne. by telling him what he has heard.

592 δ . . . βία: cf. 570n. For ἡ . . . Ὀδυσσέως βία, cf. 314n.

593-4 διώμοτοι . . . κράτος 'they sail, having solemnly and explicitly sworn to bring (Phil.), either when they have persuaded him with speech or by the compelling power of physical strength'. For the dual subject with third-person plur. verb, cf. *Ant.* 55-7 ἀδελφῶ δύο . . . | αὐτοκτονοῦντε τῷ ταλαιπῶρῳ μόρον | κοινὸν κατειργάσαντ', *OC* 342-3. This rare combination perhaps reflects the FM's unease with his mythological innovation in the preceding line, where he names Od. and 'the son of Tydeus' (cf. 570-1 with 570n.). For plur. participle with dual verb, cf. 541. ἰσχύος expresses the source and substance of the κράτος, cf. 104 ἰσχύος θράσος. ἡ μὴν typically introduces a 'strong and confident' assertion; it is most frequently used 'in oaths and pledges, usually in indirect speech' (*GP* 350-1). There is a striking contrast between the high, epic style of 593 and the base action Od. and Diomedes have sworn to perform (Pucci 232. διώματος does not occur elsewhere in extant Greek literature, but cf. *Tr.* 255 διώμοσεν, *Aj.* 1233 διωμόσω, *Tr.* 378 διώμυντο.

594 πείσαντες ἄξειν: it is unclear whether these are Od.'s words, carried over into indirect discourse, or the FM is summarizing in his own language what Od. said. Cf. 612-13 τόνδε πείσαντες λόγῳ | ἄγοιντο, where it is similarly unclear whether Helenos' words are being transmitted by the FM, or the FM is interpreting them. In both cases, there is a contradiction with 103, where Od. says categorically that Phil. cannot be persuaded or taken by force.

595-6 καὶ ταῦτ' . . . λέγοντος 'and (what is more) these things all the Achaeans heard clearly Odysseus saying'. σαφῶς goes with both ἤκουον and 596 λέγοντος.

596-7 οὗτος . . . τάδε 'for he (sc. Od.) had more confidence than the other that he would accomplish this', i.e. 'than the other had', a so-called com-
pendious comparison; θατέρου = τοῦ ἐτέρου. δράσειν τάδε (cf. 314-
15 τοιαῦτα . . . δεδράκασθαι) is dependent on τὸ θάρσος εἶχε. In failing to name
Diomedes, the FM both reminds the audience of the Prologue, where only Od.
was present, and anticipates 614-19, where Diomedes disappears and the focus
is entirely on Od. (Budelmann 2000: 118).

598-600 τίνος . . . χάριν lit. 'for the sake of what matter were the Atreidai
turning so eagerly (ἄγαν οὕτω) to this man after so much time, the very man

whom for a long time already they had rejected'? In this artful leading question, with its striking hyperbaton (τίνος . . . πράγματος χάριν), Ne. feigns spontaneous wonder at the FM's 'news' and invites him to explain it at greater length. Then he follows with two additional questions, which also seem 'designed to elicit exactly the speech that follows' (Budelmann 2000: 116). ἄγαν οὕτω modifies ἐπεστρέφοντο (cf. *El.* 884 ὥδε πιστεύεις ἄγαν), which in turn governs the gen. τοῦδ' on the model of verbs of caring and concern for. For χρόνῳ τοσῶιδε 'after so much time', cf. 360–1 οὐ μακρῶι χρόνῳ | ἐλθῶν, 722–3 πλήθει | πολλῶν μηνῶν, Moorhouse 87–8.

600 χρόνιον is pred. adj., modifying ὃν γ', the obj. of εἶχον . . . ἐκβεβληκότες. Cf. *El.* 589–90 τοὺς . . . | . . . βλαστόντας ἐκβαλοῦσ' ἔχεις. This kind of periphrasis is less common with the perf. participle than with the aor. participle. Here, with impf. εἶχον, it expresses continuous action: 'had been keeping as an outcast' (Webster).

601–2 τίς . . . κακά: as in 195–200, Ne. speaks in terms of divine will, and in part because he is the speaker, 601 τίς . . . ἵκετ' recalls *Il.* 1.240 (spoken by Achilles) ἦ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵζεται ὕλας Ἀχαιῶν. This echo helps to make the deception of Phil. more effective (cf. 548–9n.), but it also enhances for spectators and readers the disparity between the Iliadic Achilles, who speaks in spontaneous fury, and Ne., whose words are calculatedly deceptive and part of Od.'s plot against Phil. Phil., not Ne., is the real parallel in the play to Achilles in the *Il.* (Introduct., p. 26), and 'longing' for each comes to the Greek army. Cf. Phil.'s echo at 1447 of *Il.* 1.220–1, which describe Achilles' action just before the speech which Ne. echoes in 601.

τίς ὁ πόθος . . . καὶ νέμεσις: perhaps the resolutions at the same metrical position in successive lines and enjambment with a strong stop after καὶ νέμεσις express Ne.'s pretended emotion, as does the unusual phrase θεῶν βία 'violence of the gods', i.e. violence imposed by the gods. (Or perhaps θεῶν . . . νέμεσις is felt as a hendiadys: 'violent righteous anger on the part of the gods, who . . .') ἦ . . . νέμεσις offers an answer, in interrogative form, to Ne.'s questions in 598–601 (cf. *GP* 283). ἦ is more pointed than ἦ, the reading of the MSS, which would make θεῶν βία καὶ νέμεσις merely an alternative to πόθος.

602 οἵπερ . . . κακά 'who oppose and pay back evil deeds', cf. LSJ *s.v.* 1.1, 2. The middle of ἀμύνω is more common than the active in the sense 'pay back' (LSJ *s.v.* B.11), but cf. *OC* 1128 ἀμύνω τοῖσδε τοῖς λόγοις τάδε.

603–21 The FM tells his story, which is what Od. wants Phil. and Ne. to hear. He speaks artfully (cf. 130–1 οὐ . . . ποικίλως αὐδωμένου | δέχου τὰ συμφέροντα), so it is impossible to decide how much of what he says is 'true'. This artfulness colours his report of Helenos' prophecy, in particular 611–13, that the Greeks will never sack Troy unless they 'bring [Phil.] from this island that he now inhabits, after persuading him by speech'. On the face of it, this statement contradicts both the emphasis in the Prologue on the need for Phil.'s bow and arrows (78, 115–16) and Od.'s explicit statement in 103 that persuasion as well as force is

impossible. Yet Helenos' (reported) words, delivered by the FM but scripted by Od., re-energize the intrigue and challenge an audience or reader to consider (1) whether Od.'s deception, motivated up to this point wholly in human terms, may have divine backing, and (2) how the conditions imposed by the prophecy might be fulfilled (cf. Budelmann 2000: 130–1).

603–4 ἐγὼ σὲ . . . ἐκδιδάξω: the FM begins somewhat pompously and self-importantly: 'I shall teach *you* this . . . all (this) thoroughly'; cf. *El.* 680 τὸ πᾶν φράσω, also introducing a 'false messenger' speech. Both speakers make their words more persuasive through corroborative detail and conclude similarly: 620 ἤκουσας . . . πάντα ~ *El.* 761 τοιαῦτά σοι τάδ' ἐστίν). For the double acc. with ἐκδιδάσκω, cf. *OC* 1539 τὰ μὲν τοιαῦτ' οὖν εἰδὼτ' ἐκδιδάσκομεν.

605–6 Πριάμου . . . Ἑλένος: the three resolutions in two lines are striking, especially when two of them come at the beginning of the line and the third in a *figura etymologica*, ὄνομα δ' ὠνομάζετο, the heightened style of which rhetorically magnifies Helenos. Cf. *OC* 60–1 τοῦνομα | . . . ὠνομασμένοι. In 605 the resolution is of the *anceps* syllable at position 1 (vv–); in 606 it comes at position 2 (vvv), where resolution is more common. (Schein 1979: 78, Table xxxi.) Perhaps the effect of the three resolutions so close together is to focus the audience's or reader's attention on Helenos as both prophet and son of Priam and on his prophecy as requiring interpretation.

606–8 δὲν . . . εἶλε: there is a crescendo of implicit and then explicit abuse in these lines. οὗτος, referring to the absent Od., is disrespectful, and there is a sneer in μόνος, 'alone (for once)', since Od.'s night excursions in *Il.* 10 and the *Little Iliad* are made in the company of Diomedes. The FM is more explicitly insulting, when he calls Od. 'the man of whom all (sorts of) shameful and disgraceful things are said, / treacherous Odysseus', cf. 448 πανοῦργα. λωβητὸς 'disgraceful' is a Homeric term for someone who merits insult and abuse or who is so treated. For ἀκούων 'hearing' = 'is spoken of', 'has the reputation of', cf. 607, 1313, *Tr.* 721 ζῆν γὰρ κακῶς κλύουσαν οὐκ ἀνάσχετον, *El.* 724 κακῶς κλύουσα πρὸς σέθεν.

608–9 δέσμιόν τ' . . . καλὴν 'bringing him bound, he showed him (off) to the Achaians publicly, a fine prey'. δέσμιον is pred. adj., cf. 600 χρόνιον. ἐς (τὸ) μέσον is a political idiom (cf. LSJ *s.v.* μέσος *mb*), and perhaps Od.'s use of this phrase would have led some Athenian spectators to think of the Greek army in the play as a political community like their own (cf. 385 τοὺς ἐν τέλει, 386 πόλις, and the characterization of Od. as in part that of an Athenian demagogue, e.g. 96–9n.). To bind and 'show (off)' a noble prince like Helenos would be particularly shaming, and it is even more shaming to describe him as θήραν (a 'fine prey'). (Od. similarly demeans Phil. by speaking of him in terms that suggest an animal rather than a human being, cf. 30 καταυλισθεῖς, 43 φορβῆς.) Ne. follows Od.'s lead at 162, as do the Ch. at 707 and, at a low point, Phil. himself in 1107. Phil. also speaks of his hands as συνθηρώμεναι 'hunted down' (1005) and of Od. as having hunted him (1007 ὡς μ' ἐθηράσω).

610–13 **δς...τὰ νῦν:** τὰπὶ Τροίαι πέργαμα (cf. 353n.) is anticipatory dir. obj. of πέρσοιεν, which would have been πέρσετε in Helenos' dir. statement, just as εἰ μὴ...ἄγοιντο would have been ἐὰν μὴ ἄγησθε. τόνδε, the obj. of both πείσαντες and ἄγοιντο, suggests a gesture by the FM toward Phil. For οὐ μὴ, see 103n. **πείσαντες λόγῳ:** cf. 594n. In effect, the FM contradicts Od.'s strong assertion at 103 that Phil. cannot be persuaded. Given this contradiction, viewers or readers who take πείσαντες λόγῳ as part of Helenos' prophecy might suspect that these words denote the kind of apparent impossibility frequently found in Greek oracles and prophecies and that they are likely to be fulfilled in some way that cannot be imagined at first hearing. Cf. Budelmann 2000: 123–4.

614–15 **καὶ...εἰπόντ':** anticipatory ταῦτα, the obj. of εἰπόντ', is emphatic. The simultaneous aorists, denoting hearing and speaking, imply that Od. heard the words directly from Helenos, not from someone reporting that Helenos had spoken them. The main emphasis, though, is on what Helenos said, in contrast to 595–6, where the emphasis is on Od., whom the army heard *as he was speaking*.

615–16 **ὑπέσχετο...ἄγων:** Od. promised to treat Phil., a fellow Greek needed for success in the war, just as he treated a Trojan enemy: cf. 608–9 δέσμιόν τ' ἄγων | ἔδειξ'.

617–18 **οἴοιτο...ἄκοντα:** the opt. is used in ind. discourse dependent on 615 ὑπέσχετο: '(and he said that) he thought (he would bring and exhibit him), having taken him (being) very much willing, but if he should not be willing, (having taken him) against his will'. Cf. 603–21n.

618–19 **καὶ...τυχών** 'and if he did not succeed (lit. 'did not hit the mark in these things')', he bade the one wishing (to do so) to cut off his head'. Anticipatory τούτων is emphatic because of its distance from τυχών, on which it is dependent (cf. 614 ταῦτα, *Ant.* 458–60 τούτων ἐγὼ οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἀνδρὸς οὐδενὸς | φρόνημα δέισαο', ἐν θεοῖσι τὴν δίκην | δώσειν). At first τούτων seems to be causal gen. (cf. Campbell, *Essay* §10.γ.1.d, Moorhouse 70–1), which would enable the audience or reader to make provisional sense of the sentence before the construction with τυχών becomes clear (cf. Budelmann 2000: 37–8 with n. 22).

κάρα...θέλοντι: the FM describes Od. as speaking in the same way he speaks at *Il.* 2.259 μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ κάρη ὤμοισιν ἐπείη (if he does not beat and drive off Thersites) and at *Od.* 16.102 αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἅπ' ἐμείο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φῶς (if he does not punish the Suitors). The main effect of these epic reminiscences, which at least some spectators (and readers) would immediately recognize, is to call attention to the distance between Od.'s epic heroism and his characterization here as a late fifth-century Athenian demagogue (Pucci 235). Cf. 601–2n. For ἐφίεμαι 'bid', 'command' = 'permit', 'allow', see LSJ *s.v.* ἐφίημι B.2.

620 **ἡκουσας...πάντα** rounds off the speech disingenuously. Ne. and Phil. have certainly not heard πάντα. Cf. 603–4n.

620–1 τὸ σπεύδειν . . . περί lit. ‘and haste to you, even to yourself, I recommend, and if you care about anyone’ (i.e. ‘to anyone you care about’). Word-order, adverbial καί in καὶτῶι, and enjambment combine to make αὐτῶι emphatic. Cf. *OC* 868 σὲ καὶτὸν καὶ γένος τὸ σόν. περί (for the accent, cf. 6n.) and κήδηι both govern the gen., capping the FM’s (well-rehearsed) speech.

622–5 Phil. is amazed that Od., ‘that total plague’, would ever swear to bring him to the Greek army by persuasion, and he expresses the unlikelihood of this happening in words that are thematically marked (cf. 311 with n., 946–7, 1018, 1030; *Introd.*, p. 15).

622 οἶμοι τάλας: cf. 416 with n. ἡ πᾶσα βλάβη sounds colloquial, but there is no comic parallel. Cf. *El.* 301 ὁ πᾶντ’ ἀναλκίς οὗτος, ἡ πᾶσα βλάβη, where disparaging οὗτος also may be colloquial.

623 ἔμ’. . . στελεῖν ‘did (he) swear to persuade *me* and convey (*me*) to the Achaeans?’ ἔμ’ is emphatic as the first word in the sentence and the line. For στελεῖν ‘convey’, ‘bring’ rather than ‘send’, cf. 983, *OT* 859–60 τὸν ἐργάτην | πέμψον τινὰ στελοῦντα, *OC* 297–8 σκοπὸς δέ νιν | . . . οἴχεται στελῶν.

624 πεισθήσομαι γὰρ ὧδε ‘(persuade me? No!) For in that case I will be persuaded . . .’ Cf. *GP* 62. At the end of the play Phil. is, in effect, reborn, through the persuasion of Herakles, from his virtual death on Lemnos into the world of heroic achievement. Cf. *Introd.*, pp. 30–1. κάξ Ἀἰδοῦ ‘even from Hades’ (house)’. κάξ is crasis of καὶ ἐξ.

624–5 θανῶν . . . ἀνελθεῖν ‘to come back up to the light, when I am dead’, i.e. to be reborn. Cf. Homeric ὄρν φάος ἡέλιοιο = ‘to be alive’; typically death occurs when ‘darkness covers the eyes’, e.g. *Il.* 4.461 = 6.11, 21.181. Cf. 415 with n., 663–4 with n.

625 ὥσπερ . . . πατήρ: Sisyphos, cf. 449n. οὐκείνου is crasis of ὁ ἐκείνου.

626–7 οὐκ . . . ναῦν: the FM breaks off with a striking line consisting of nine words, all but one of which are monosyllables, followed (in enjambment) by another monosyllable at the beginning of the following line (cf. 362 with 361–2n., 379 with n.). This way of speaking reflects his (pretended) fear and eagerness to be gone before the (supposedly) imminent approach of Od. and Diomedes.

627 σφῶιν . . . θεός: the FM exits, never to return, with an apparently straightforward but actually ambiguous wish. If dual σφῶιν refers, as seems clear, to Phil. and Ne., who (supposedly) share the same objective and the same feelings (cf. the Chorus at 539, Hahnemann 2011), to ‘benefit you both as well as possible’ would imply, for Ne., ‘by arranging for you to go to Troy to help sack the city’, while for Phil. it would suggest ‘by returning home’, and different spectators and readers would each have their own interpretations and might be aware of these two meanings simultaneously.

628–75 Phil. is eager to leave at once to avoid Od. and Diomedes; Ne., after resisting on the grounds that the wind is unfavourable (639–40, 642), finally agrees to depart, after Phil. has taken whatever he desires to bring with him from his cave (645–6). Phil. assures Ne. that he needs only to retrieve a herb that

relieves his pain and any arrow that may have slipped out of his quiver, leading Ne. to ask, disingenuously, if the bow Phil. is holding is the famous one. When Phil. tells him that it is, Ne. asks if he might be permitted to handle it, and Phil. assures him that he is welcome to do so, because Ne. has saved his life, rescued him from his enemies, and enabled him to return home (655–70). The scene ends with a pledge of reciprocal friendship and Ne.'s statement that 'a friend is better than any possession', before Phil. leads Ne. into the cave. Throughout the scene, Phil. uses emotional and morally charged language, while Ne. for the most part speaks coolly, in practical terms. Only at 660–1 does Ne. express emotion (ἐρῶ . . . ἔρωθ') and use a moral term (θέμις) calculatedly, with a view to deceiving Phil. and getting hold of the bow.

628–30 οὐκουν . . . μέσοις: ἐστί must be understood with τὰδ' . . . δεινά, and τὰδ' anticipates τὸν . . . μέσοις. ἐμ' is emphatic by its position at the beginning of the line, and Phil.'s account of Od.'s confident expectation is given added force in 630 by the tension between metrical and rhetorical form: ὄγοντ' at position 6 is connected syntactically with the preceding line and a half, while ἐν at the caesural position 7 goes with Ἀργείοις μέσοις in the second colon of the line. νεῶς is gen. of separation (cf. 613 νήσου), evoking an image of Od. leading the bound Phil. from the ship in order to exhibit him to the army, as he did Helenos (cf. 608–9~630, with 608–9n.).

631–2 οὐ . . . ἐχίδνης: for ἐχθίστης . . . ἐχίδνης, cf. 266–7 with 265–7n. θᾶσσον ἄν . . . κλύοιμι is said ironically. The asyndeton and double superlative, like the hyperbaton and enjambment, are emphatic and reflect Phil.'s heightened emotion. Cf. *OC* 743–4 πλεῖστον . . . κάκιστος, *Eur. Med.* 1323 ὦ μέγιστον ἐχθίστη γύναι.

633–4 ἀλλ' . . . τολμητὰ 'but for that man all things are to be said and all things to be dared'. ἀλλ' is 'adversative', i.e. it implies a contrast or negation, in this case of Phil.'s determination not to go to Troy with Od. For the absence of μέν in the first of two correlative clauses, cf. 779, *Tr.* 517–18 ἦν χερὸς, ἦν δὲ τό- | ξων πάταγος, *GP* 163.

634 καὶ . . . ἴξεται: καὶ is almost inferential: '(Od. will say or do anything,) so I now know that he will come'. The fut. indic. expresses Phil.'s certainty, as it often expresses the certainty of Sophoclean heroes (Knox 1964: 10–11, 25).

635 ἀλλ' is both adversative and hortatory with χωρῶμεν (*GP* 13–4).

637–8 ἦ τοι . . . ἤγαγεν 'timely haste brings sleep and respite, once the toil is over'. τοι and the 'gnomic' aorist mark this as a maxim or general truth of a kind that often concludes speeches in Soph. Cf. *Ant.* 313–14 with Griffith's note. κἀνάπαυλαν is crasis of καὶ ἀνάπαυλαν.

639–57 consist of three six-line units: 639–44 and 645–50 each include 2 lines spoken by Ne, followed by 1 spoken by Phil., 1 by Ne., and 2 by Phil.; 652–7 has 2 lines spoken by Phil., followed by 1 spoken by Ne., 1 by Phil., and 2 by Ne. 651 connects the second and third of the three units, referring back to 649–50 and forward to 652–3.

639–40 ἐπειδὴν . . . ἀντιστάτῃ ‘whenever the wind from the prow (i.e. ‘the wind facing us’, the ‘head-wind’) lets up, then we will set sail. For now it stands against (us)’. Contrast 1450–1 ὅδ’ ἐπείγει γὰρ | καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς κατὰ πρύμναν with n., cf. 466–7n. For intransitive ἀνῆι, cf. 764, 705 ἐξανείη, LSJ *s.v.* ἀνίημι π.8.a. Ne. does not mention any opposing head-wind at 526, when he says πλέωμεν, ὁρμάσθω ταχύς, and an audience or reader might wonder why he does so now and whether the FM’s report of Helenos’ prophecy, especially the detail that Phil. must be persuaded to come to Troy, gives Ne. pause. There is no indication in these lines that Ne. wants to delay the departure for moral rather than practical reasons. τοῦκ is crasis of τὸ ἐκ.

641 αἰ . . . κακά: another general truth or proverbial maxim, as indicated here by αἰ, cf. 637–8n. The strong sense-break after ἐσθ’ at position 6, following the caesura, gives emphasis to the first half of the line. Phil.’s morally resonant language (καλός, κακά) could lead the audience or readers to ask themselves what would constitute a καλὸς πλοῦς for Ne., but in 642 Ne. himself continues to speak in amoral, strictly practical terms.

642 κἀκείνοισι . . . ἐναντία ‘these things (are) against them too’, i.e. they too face an opposing wind. κἀκείνοισι is crasis of καὶ ἐκείνοισι.

643–4 οὐκ ἔστι . . . βίαι ‘for pirates there’s no opposing wind, when it’s possible (for them) both to steal and to plunder with violence’. There is an implied comparison between ‘those’ (642) coming to get Phil. (including Od.) and pirates, but Phil. expresses the idea more or less as a general truth (cf. 641), with ‘those’ rather than Od. in focus. κλέψαι, however, suggests the cunning and verbal deception (cf. 55n.), and βίαι, the violence, that characterize Od. throughout the play. χάρπάσαι is crasis of καὶ ἀρπάσαι.

645–7 ἀλλ’ . . . ἀλλ’: Ne.’s ἀλλά in 645 signals an agreement that Phil. has, in effect, forced from him; Phil.’s ἀλλά in 647 indicates merely that there are, in fact, some items he needs and desires. Cf. *GP* 16, 17, 20. ἀλλ’ . . . ἔχει

lit. ‘but if it seems best (to you), let us go, when you have taken (that) for which need and longing most grip you’. λαβὼν agrees with part of the plur. subj. of χωρῶμεν. There is no exact parallel, but cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 141–2 εὐδεις; ἀνίστω, κάπολακτίσας ὕπνον, | ἰδῶμεθ’ εἴ τι τοῦδε φροίμου ματᾶ (‘Do you sleep? Stand up, and having kicked off sleep, | let us see if anything in this prelude is in vain’.)

ἀλλ’, εἰ δοκεῖ with a first-person hortatory subjunct. signals Ne.’s surrender to Phil. and ends the discussion (cf. Ismene at *Ant.* 98 ἀλλ’, εἰ δοκεῖ σοι, στέιχε, Agamemnon at Aesch. *Ag.* 944–5 ἀλλ’, εἰ, δοκεῖ σοι ταῦθ’, ὑπαί τις ἀρβύλας | λύοι τάχος). The same words suggest a false (or premature) ending of the play at 526, which is interrupted by the entry of the FM at 539–41, and at 1402, where Her.’s intervention *ex machina* at 1409 prevents Phil. and Ne. from leaving. At 1469–71 the Ch.’s hortatory χωρῶμεν δὴ πάντες ἀολλεῖς . . . ἐπευξάμενοι . . . signals the actual, divinely authorized ending.

647 οὐ πολλῶν ἄπο ‘though (there is) not much (to choose) from’. For the accent on ἄπο and 648 ἐπι, see 6n.

648 τί . . . ἔπι ‘what is this which is not aboard my ship’?

649–50 ὧι . . . πάνυ lit. ‘with which especially I always (i.e. ‘on each occasion’) lull this wound to sleep, so as to make it completely gentle’. Cf. 696–9 οὐδ’ ὅς . . . αἰμάδα . . . ἐλκέων | ἐνθήρου ποδὸς ἥπιόισι φύλλοις | κατευνάσειεν, *Il.* 16.523–4 τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι, | κοίμησον δ’ ὀδύνας. The φύλλον tames the wild beast in the foot.

651 τί γάρ . . . λαβεῖν: as often, γάρ introduces a question marking a turn to a new topic or seeking further information, cf. 433, *GP* 82. ἐρῶς is a stronger word than either χρεῖα or πόθος in 646. Ne. is hinting at Phil.’s bow and arrows; cf. 660, where he speaks of his own ἔρωσ to handle them.

652–3 εἰ μοί τι . . . παρερρήκεν ‘if any of these arrows has slipped aside (*sc.* out of the quiver), forgotten by me’. Phil. makes a deictic gesture, raising aloft or pointing to his arrow-container, and this gesture is made more emphatic by the placement of τῶνδ’ at position 6, following and agreeing with τόξων at position 5, the caesura. μοί is dat. of agent with the perf. pass. participle. ὥς . . . λαβεῖν ‘so that I don’t leave it (behind) for someone to take’. For λίπω μὴ instead of μὴ λίπω, see 66–7 with n. For exegetical λαβεῖν, cf. 81 with 81–2n.

654 ἦ . . . τόξ: ἦ . . . γάρ is both affirmative and interrogative, expecting a positive response, cf. 248 with n., 322. κλεινός ‘famous’ (i.e. ‘heroic’, ‘associated with heroic epic’), is here meant seriously, but the word is often used ironically in late fifth-century Euripidean tragedy that is roughly contemporary with *Ph.*, e.g. *Or.* 17 ὁ κλεινός, εἰ δὴ κλεινός, Ἀγαμέμνων ἔφω (cf. Winnington-Ingram 1960: 34–5).

655 βαστάζω χεροῖν ‘hold aloft in my two hands’ (*LSJ s.v.* βαστάζω i.1, ii.2), cf. 1127.

656–7 ἄρ’ . . . θεόν: Ne. seems to speak solemnly, as Phil. does in 655, but he is being disingenuous. He knows perfectly well that Phil. must be holding, and must all along have been holding, his ‘invincible weapon’ (78); cf. Schmidt 1973: 125.

ὥστε . . . λαβεῖν ‘so as to get a look from even closer’. ὥστε is used after ἔστιν, as it often is after verbs expressing (cap)ability or asking, giving, or receiving permission (*K–G* ii: 11–12, *Anm.* 9). προσκύσαι: cf. 533–4n. It is difficult to decide if προσκύσαι is meant literally or figuratively (or both), i.e. whether Ne. actually bows down to or kisses the bow or simply venerates it in words. Either way, Ne. betrays a sincere respect for Phil.’s weapon – perhaps because it had also belonged to Herakles, the greatest of heroes – that goes beyond the intrigue to gain possession of it: cf. Paduano 668n. 43, Pucci 238–9.

658–9 σοί γ’ . . . γενήσεται ‘for *you*, child, both this (is possible), and (anything) else of mine which (is of a sort that) might be beneficial for you will be granted’. σοί γ’ gains emphasis by its position at the beginning of the line and the sentence. Phil.’s personal wish to ‘be beneficial’ to Ne. recalls and stands in contrast to Od.’s more impersonal and opportunistic command at 131, δέχον τὰ συμφέροντα . . . Cf. 130–1n.

660 καὶ μὴν frequently introduces a positive reaction to the words of the previous speaker, cf. *GP* 353–4. τὸν δ' ἔρωθ' οὕτως ἔχω 'I have the desire in this way (i.e. 'as follows')'. οὕτως modifies ἔχω and anticipates 661 εἴ μοι . . . πάρες. Cf. Xen *An.* 2.2.2 οὕτω χρὴ ποιεῖν· ἔάν . . . εἰ δὲ μή . . . For ἔρω γ' and ἔρωθ', see 651n.

661 εἰ . . . θέμις: understand εἴη in the protasis of a fut. less-vivid ('should-would') condition; similarly, after εἰ δὲ μή, understand θέμις εἴη.

662–70 With great emotion Phil. assures Ne. that owing to the religious appropriateness of his words (657, 661) and because he has rescued Phil., he will be able to touch the bow and, in an act of reciprocal friendship, return it to the man who gave it to him; to boast, alone among mortals, that he handled it because of his ἀρετή. For, Phil. implies, Ne. does the same kind of good deed by which Phil. himself came to possess the bow. The repeated anaphora of ὅς (3x in 665) shows the intensity and depth of Phil.'s feeling, as he enumerates all for which he is grateful: return to life, homeland, father, friends, and (climactically) being 'raised beyond (the reach) of the enemies beneath whom [he] was (oppressed)' (665–6). Phil.'s morally charged language (ῥοσια, θέμις, ἀρετή) does not trouble Ne., who has in fact been deceiving him in a way that is anything but pious, lawful, and virtuous (and that seemed αἰσχρόν to Ne. himself at 108, cf. 87–9, 94–5). Phil.'s language, however, would make some attentive viewers or readers even more conscious of Ne.'s hypocrisy in pretending to be Phil.'s friend (cf. 671–3), while actually betraying him, and more sympathetic to Phil. as Ne.'s (and *Od.*'s) victim.

662 ῥοσια . . . θέμις 'the things you say are pious and so, my child, it is right'. For the association of ideas, cf. *El.* 432–3 οὐ γὰρ σοι θέμις | οὐδ' ῥοσιον.

663–4 ὅς γ' . . . δέδωκας ('because you are) the very one who alone have granted me to see this light of the sun', i.e. 'this light of life'. For ἡλίου . . . εἰσορᾶν . . . φάος 'to be alive', cf. 415, 624–5n. ὅς γ' is both limitative and causal, cf. 60 with 60n, 1386.

664–6 ὅς . . . πέρα: with intense emotion marked by the fourfold repetition of ὅς in two lines, Phil. continues to explain why Ne. will be permitted to handle the bow. No verb is expressed in the first two relative clauses in 665, and in each instance δέδωκας . . . ἰδεῖν must be supplied from the previous line. τῶν ἐμῶν | ἐχθρῶν depends on the (two, contrasting) prepositions, ἐνερθεν and πέρα, and gains emphasis from the enjambment. Οἰτρίαν evokes not only Phil.'s homeland but the scene of the 'good deed' to which he alludes in 670, lighting the pyre of Herakles, for which he received the hero's bow, cf. 801–3. In both passages Soph. ignores another version of the story, known from Apollod. 2.7.7, according to which Phil.'s father, Poias, rather than Phil. himself, received the bow for lighting Her.'s pyre. On Phil.'s contrasting attitudes toward friends and enemies, cf. 314–16, Blundell 1989: 195–7.

668 δόντι δοῦναι: Phil. emphasizes the reciprocal relation of φιλία that he envisions.

668–9 κάξεπεύξασθαι . . . μόνον: κάξ- is crasis of καὶ ἔξ-. Phil.'s language suggests that he and Ne. share a kind of epic heroism, cf. *Il.* 5.119 ἐπεύχεται, 11.431 ἐπεύξεαι.

ἀρετῆς ἕκατι: Ionic ἕκῃτι 'on account of', 'for the sake of' does not occur in the *Il.* and is used in the *Od.* only with the names of gods, e.g. *Od.* 15.319 Ἑρμείῳ ἕκῃτι, cf. 19.86, 20.42. The Doric form ἕκατι is used in choral lyric and tragedy with divine names, e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 758–9 Παλλάδος καὶ Λοξίου | ἕκατι, and some other nouns, e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 436–7 ἕκατι μὲν δαιμόνων, | ἕκατι δ' ἁμᾶν χερῶν, but nowhere else with so abstract a concept as ἀρετή. The word ἀρετή is surprisingly rare in Soph., considering the 'virtue' shown by the heroes of his surviving plays. It occurs only six times in the seven surviving plays, including *Ph.* 669, 1420, 1425.

670 εὐργετῶν: in Phil.'s mind there is a transgenerational link between Her., Ne., and himself through the particular kind of excellence that involves 'doing good deeds', though at this point in the play Phil. cannot know that this excellence will result in his rejoining the army at Troy and helping Ne. to sack the city, as Herakles had done (cf. 1439–40 with 1437–41n.).

671–3 Ne. responds to Phil.'s gratitude, his affectionate ὦ τέκνον, and his association of Ne. with himself and Herakles, by declaring that they are friends. He seals this declaration with a play on Phil.'s name: 'a friend would be more powerful (κρείσσω) than any possession' (κτήματος . . . φίλος/Φίλο-κτήτης, cf. Campbell 81–2, Daly 1982: 440–2), meaning that his having taken Phil. as a friend is even 'more powerful' than handling the bow. In this way, Ne. opportunistically appropriates φίλος, as a social institution and ethical value, for his plot against Phil. The MSS attribute 671–3 to Phil., but Phil. would not make a general statement of friendship (673) with a play on his own name. Such a statement, however, is appropriate to Ne., for whom gaining 'a friend . . . more powerful than any possession' is part of his (and *Od.*'s) attempt to gain 'the possession of triumph' (81). The asyndeton in 671 and the emphatic position of φίλος at the end of 673, picking up φίλον in the same position in 671, give Ne.'s statement particular force, but there is a gap between what such friendship must mean to Phil., who has been for so long 'alone, | isolated and friendless' (227–8), and to Ne., who uses it instrumentally and opportunistically against Phil.

οὐκ . . . φίλον: ἄχθομαι with suppl. part. is more common in prose than in verse (LSJ s.v. π). The litotes, οὐκ ἄχθομαι, is stronger than if Ne. had said, e.g., 'I am glad to have seen you . . .'

ὅστις . . . εὖ δρᾶν . . . ἐπίσταται is Phil., who 'knows how to do well' by letting Ne. handle the bow or anything else of his, in return for having fared well at Ne.'s hands.

674 χωροῖς . . . εἰσω 'please go in' is more courteous than 651 ἄλλ' ἔκφερ' αὐτό, in keeping with the friendship established in the intervening lines. This time, too, Phil. responds more courteously, offering to bring his new friend into his dwelling (674 καὶ σέ γ' εἰσάξω).

674–5 τὸ . . . λαβεῖν 'for my being ill longs to get you as my helper standing beside me'. For the definite article at the end of one line agreeing with a word at or

near the beginning of the next, cf. 13, 449, 533, 665, 1063, 1327, 1376. Substantial $\tau\acute{o}$ νοσοῦν suggests both δ νοσῶν and η νόσος. This form of expression is relatively uncommon in Soph., but cf. *Tr.* 144 $\tau\acute{o}$ γὰρ νέαζον with Easterling's note. It is exceptionally common in Thuc., e.g. 1.36.1 $\tau\acute{o}$ μὲν δεδιὸς αὐτοῦ... $\tau\acute{o}$ δὲ θαρσοῦν... 1.142.8 ἐν τῷ μελετῶντι. Cf. Moorhouse 257-8, Smyth §1153, and Phil. accepts physical support as they begin to leave, only to be stopped by Her. at 1409.

676-729: CHORAL SONG (STASIMON)

This song, the only stasimon in the play sung and danced exclusively by the Chorus, apart from the brief lyric outbursts at 391-402 and 507-18, comes just before the halfway point. 'It faces forward and backward (just as its wording refers to both past and future), focusing the audience's awareness of what has happened and conditioning its response to what will follow' (Tarrant 1986: 128). In particular, through its allusions to Herakles in *antistr.* β, it anticipates the conclusion of the drama. The song consists of two strophic pairs in primarily aeolic metre with choriambic expansions and a brief dactylic sequence in *str.* and *antistr.* α (cf. West 1982: 118; it is analysed by Dale 1981-3: 46-7 under the rubric 'Aeolo-choriambic'). The entire ode consists of three sentences: 676-86, 687-717 (including the final five lines of *str.* α and all of *antistr.* α and *str.* β), and 718-29 (*antistr.* β). The first sentence contrasts Phil., as one who has 'perished thus unworthily' (686), with Ixion, the transgressor punished by Zeus for his attempted rape of Hera and a great exemplar of ingratitude. The second sentence expresses the Chorus' wonder at how Phil. could have survived in his sickness, all alone on the island, with no companion or caregiver. The third says that now, 'after (and 'because of') those things, he will end up happy and great' (720-1), because he has encountered the 'child of noble men', who will restore him to his ancestral home in the place where Herakles ascended to the gods in a divine blaze - a blaze, as Phil. has just reminded Ne. (670), that was kindled by Phil. himself and for which he received Herakles' bow and arrows.

The Chorus sing the whole song in accordance with their role as helper to Ne. in carrying out the deceptive plan of Od. (cf. Schmidt 1973: 118-20). They express the same combination of sympathetic amazement at Phil.'s suffering and calculated, practical falsehood that they have shown since the *parodos* and will continue to express in the *kommos* following Phil.'s paroxysm (827-64). It is not necessary to assume, as some scholars have done, that they sing in a low voice so as not to be overheard, or that they opportunistically shift, at the beginning of *antistr.* β, from sympathetic wonder at Phil.'s survival on the island to a deliberately misleading statement that Ne. will bring him home, because they hear or see Phil. and Ne. emerging from the cave. The stasimon, like the rest of the play, is problematic, challenging an audience or reader to consider, among other things, what it might mean to say that Phil., because he has met Ne., will

'end up happy and great after (and "because of") his sufferings on Lemnos. The Chorus may imply (or their words might imply to an audience or reader that Phil. has somehow earned or merited his eventual happiness and greatness by his suffering. The Chorus associate this happiness and greatness with a return home and, by allusion, with the greatness of Phil.'s friend and heroic exemplar, Herakles, but Herakles himself, at the end of the play, associates Phil.'s heroic and heroic pre-eminence with his killing of Paris and decisive role in winning the war at Troy. Perhaps the Chorus should be understood in light of the dramatic irony often associated with other Sophoklean choruses and characters, whose language suggests truths of which the singers or speakers themselves are, at least consciously, ignorant. Cf. *OT* 863-910, *Ant.* 944-87 with Griffith's comment.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

676	λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσ', ὅπωπα δ' οὐ μάλα	ia trim
691	ἴν' αὐτὸς ἦν πρόσουρος, οὐκ ἔχων βάσιν	
677-8	τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ (τῶν) Διὸς	chor - ghyt
692-3	οὐδέ τιν' ἐγγύρων κακογείτονα	
679-80	[Ἰξίονα] κατ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα	x - D
694-5	παρ' ὧι στόνον ἀντίτυπον	
	δέσμιον ὥς ἔβαλεν	D
	(τὸν) βαρυβρῶτ' ἀποκλάυ-	
	παγκρατῆς Κρόνου παῖς	antypē
	σειεν αἱματηρόν	
681-2	ἄλλον δ' οὐτίν' ἔγωγ'	greater Asc!
696-7	οὐδ' ὅς [τάν] θερμοτάταν	
	οἶδα κλύων οὐδ' ἐσιδὼν μοῖραι	
	αἱμάδα κηκιόμεναν ἐλκέων	phai
683	τοῦδ' ἐχθρόνι συντυχόντα θνατῶν,	
698	ἐνθήρου ποδὸς ἡπίοισι φύλλοις	ba - leklyth
684	ὅς οὐτ' ἔρξας τιν' οὐτε νοσφίσας,	
699	κατευνάσειεν, εἴ τις ἐμπέσοι,	

685	— ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ἀλλ' ἴσος ἐν (γ') ἴσοις ἀνὴρ	chor dim A
700	φορβάδος ἔκ τι γᾶς ἐλών·	
686	— ∪ — — ∪ — ∪ — ῶλλυθ' ὦδ' ἀναξίως.	lekyth
701	εἶρπε δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλ(αχ)αῖ	
687	∪ ∪ — — ∪ — ∪ — τόδε (δ' αὖ) θαῦμά μ' ἔχει ^b	aceph chor dim
702	τότ' ἄν εἰλυόμενος,	
688	— ∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — — πῶς ποτε πῶς ποτ' ἀμφιπλήκτων	dodrans A + ∪ — —
703	παῖς ἄτερ ὥς φίλας τιθήνας,	
689	∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — — ῥοθίων μόνος κλύων, πῶς	anacr
704	ῑθεν εὐμάρει' ὑπάρχοι	
690a	∪ ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — — ἄρα πανδᾶκρυτον οὖτω	anacr
705a	πόρου, ἀνίκ' ἐξαεῖη	
690b	∪ — ∪ — — ^{b,c} βιοτὰν κατέσχευ.	?
705b	δακέθυμος ἄτα·	

The metre of these two stanzas, like that of the *parodos* and the non-strophic exchange between Phil. and the Ch. in 1081–1217, is mainly aeolic, with choriambic expansion – the insertion of additional choriambic between ‘base’ and *clausula* – that is typical of Sophoklean aeolic verse. Like the *parodos* it begins with a lyric iambic trimeter (676/691); this is followed by two dactylic lines, each of which ends with a *clausula* commonly found in aeolic metre. All three lines are separate metrical periods, whose final syllables in the strophe and antistrophe are marked by *brevis in longo*. From 681/696 on the cola are clearly aeolic, until a clausular *lekythion* in 686/701, after which the metre of the final five lines is ambiguous. It seems best to recognize a modulation through 688/703 — ∪ — ∪ — — into ionic metre (‘anacreontics’) in 689–90a/704–5a, with a *clausula* in 690b/705b that is as appropriate to an ionic as an aeolic context. In tragedy, esp. Soph., there are frequent ambiguities of aeolic with ionic metre. West 1982: 120 observes that ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — is an anacreontic in Ionic contexts, but where it occurs in aeolic contexts, it may be a transformation of × ∪ — ∪ — —, a familiar Aeolic colon (‘hagesichorean’); he adds, ‘Sometimes (again especially in Sophocles) we encounter things that it is no use trying to label’; cf. Martinelli 1997: 227. (Alternatively, the last five lines could be considered aeolic, with 687/702 understood as choriambic dimeter B without its first heavy syllable (aceph chor. dim. B), and 688–90b/703–5b as a series of 3 chor. dim. A (— ∪ ∪ — ∪ —) followed

by a clausular *aristophaneum* (— — — — —). The disadvantage of this arrangement is a conflict between word-end and colon-end in both strophe and antistrophe: 688–90b πῶς ποτε πῶς ποτ' ἀμφιπλή- | κτων ῥοθίων μόνος κλύων, | πῶς ἄρα πανδάκρυτον οὐ- | τω βιοτὰν κατέσχευεν in responsion with 703–5b παῖς ἄτερ ὡς φίλας τιθή- | νας, ὅθεν εὐμάρει' ὑπάρ- | χοι πόρου, ἀνίκ' ἐξανεί- | η δακέθυμος ἄτα.)

Metre: strophe and antistrophe β

706–7	οὐ φορβὰν ἱερᾶς γᾶς σπόρον, οὐκ ἄλλων	lesser Ascl
718–9	νῦν δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν παιδὸς ὑπαντήσας	
708–9	αἶρων τῶν νεμόμεσθ' ἀνέρες ἀλφησταί,	lesser Ascl
720–1	εὐδαίμων ἀνύσει καὶ μέγας ἐκ κείνων	
710	πλήν ἐξ ὠκυβόλων εἴ ποτε τόξων	lesser Ascl
722	ὃς νιν ποντοτοπῶρι δούρατι, πλήθει	
711–2	πτανοῖς ἰοῖς ἀνύσειε γαστρὶ φορβάν.	× + phal
723–4	πολλῶν μηνῶν, πατρίαν ἄγει πρὸς αὐλὰν	
713	ὦ μελέα ψυχᾶ	dodrans A
725	Μηλιάδων νυμφᾶν	
714–5	ὃς μὴδ' οἶνοχύτου πώματος ἦσθη δεκέτει χρόνῳ,	greater Ascl
726–7	Σπερχεῖοῦ τε παρ' ὄχθαις, ἴν' ὁ χάλκασπις ἀνὴρ θεοῖς	
716	λεύσσων δ' ὅπου γνοίη, στατὸν εἰς ὕδωρ	— — — + tel
728	πλάθει θεὸς θείῳ πυρὶ παμφάης,	
717	αἰεὶ προσενώμα.	reiz
729	Οἴτας ὑπὲρ ὄχθων.	

The aeolic metre of strophe and antistrophe β is clearer and more straightforward than that of strophe and antistrophe α. Every line consists of a familiar aeolic colon, sometimes with external expansion at the beginning of the line and/or syncopation at the end.

676–80 λόγῳ . . . παῖς 'I have heard in story, but not actually seen, that the all-powerful son of Kronos hurled the one who approached the bed of Zeus, bound, onto a winged (i.e. "flying") wheel'. ἐξήκουσ' suggests something heard at a distance (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 397 πρόσσωθεν ἐξήκουσα . . . βοήν), and δρομάδα (a

favourite Euripidean word, which occurs only here in Soph.), something moving at high speed. For a similar suggestion of velocity, with the same vowel sounds and resolution, cf. *Ant.* 108 φυγάδα πρόδρομον. παγκρατής . . . παῖς gains emphasis by its position at the end of its grammatical clause and as a clausular ithyphallic colon (— — — —). Ixion may seem an unlikely figure for the Chorus to mention in the same breath as Phil., but Sophoklean choruses frequently allude to antithetical as well as similar mythological models, clarifying not only by comparison but by contrast and leaving open the possibility of multiple, even contradictory interpretations. Cf. *Ant.* 823ff., 944ff. Here the Chorus contrast events known only by hearsay – Ixion’s notorious and hubristic ingratitude – with what they have just seen – the behaviour of Phil. summarized by Ne. in 672 as εὖ δρᾶν εὖ παθῶν ἐπίσταται. Ixion had been purified by Zeus for the murder of his father-in-law, but then tried (unsuccessfully) to rape Hera, for which Zeus had him bound forever to a flying or rolling wheel of fire. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.21–42, esp. 21–5: ‘they say that by the commands of the gods, Ixion tells this to mortals, as he rolls everywhere on his winged wheel: to approach and repay a benefactor with gentle requital’. The deletion of Ἰξίονα at the beginning of 678–80 as a marginal gloss on τὸν πελάταν . . . Διός, together with Porson’s insertion of τῶν before Διός in 677, restores metrical responsion with 692–5 in the antistrophe. (τῶν) also provides idiomatic syntax: cf. 1406, 1411, *OC* 1158 βωμῶι . . . τῷ Ποσειδῶνος. τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων: for the sexual connotation, cf. *Tr.* 17 πρὶν τῇσδε κοίτης ἐμπελασθῆναι ποτε. Verbs of approaching and meeting take the gen. rather than the dat., when they imply sharing or reaching/obtaining. Cf. 1327 πελασθεὶς φύλακος, *Aj.* 709 πελάσαι νεῶν, Smyth §1353 with §§1349, 1350, K–G 1.352–3. Διός . . . Κρόνου παῖς: ‘the son of Kronos’ punished the one who approached ‘Zeus’s bed’. 677–80, though sung by the Chorus, are ‘focalized’ by Zeus, i.e. they express his viewpoint; this involves Zeus’s way of thinking about himself in the third person that is in accordance with his supreme power and majesty, which Ixion offended. If the Chorus sang, ‘The son of Kronos’ punished the one who approached ‘his bed’ (rather than ‘Zeus’s bed’), their statement would be milder.

683 τοῦδ’ = τῆς τοῦδε μοίρας, a ‘compendious’ comparison after ἐχθίονι, cf. 597 θατέρου.

684 ὅς: causal, cf. 721. οὐτ’ . . . νοσφίσας: understand τι, ‘neither having done anything to anyone nor deprived anyone of anything’. οὐτ’ ἔρξας τιν’ may echo *Od.* 4.690 οὐτε τιναῖς ῥέξας ἐξαΐσιον (cf. Eust. 756, 16). Such Homeric echoes are frequent in Soph.; cf., in this stasimon, 707 ἄνδρες ἀλφηισταί and 721 ποντοπόρῳ δούρατι. For νοσφίσας, cf. 1427, Aesch. *Cho.* 438, 620.

685 ἴσος . . . ἀνὴρ ‘a man just, at least among (i.e. “in the judgement of”) the just’. Cf. *OT* 677 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἴσος ‘but just in (the judgement of) these men’, Plato, *Leg.* 957c2 τὸν μέλλοντα δικαστὴν ἴσον ἔσεσθαι, LSJ s.v. ἴσος II.3. There may also be a suggestion that Phil. is an ‘equal among equals’. Hermann’s (γ’) restores metrical responsion with 700 and provides appropriate sense: Phil. would not

be just in the judgement of those like Od. and the sons of Atreus, who treated him unjustly. This is in keeping with Phil.'s attitude toward friends and enemies throughout the play.

686 ὤλλυθ': the impf. suggests that in the Ch.'s mind, Phil. was and still is perishing, cf. 252 διωλλύμην, 311 ἀπόλλυμαι. Here, as throughout the play, Phil.'s life on the island is a virtual, or symbolic, death or dying. Cf. 311n.

687 τόδε... ἔχει 'in this respect, again, amazement holds me', i.e. 'at this I marvel'. τόδε is internal acc. of respect, not nom. agreeing with θαῦμα. Cf. *Od.* 20.217–18 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τόδε θυμὸς... | πόλλ' ἐπιδινεῖται. Contrast 410 οὐ τι τοῦτο θαῦμ' ἔμοιγε, where τοῦτο is subj. of ἐστὶ understood, and θαῦμ' is pred. nom.

688–90b πῶς ποτε... κατέσχευ: the repetitions πῶς ποτε, πῶς ποτ'... πῶς ἄρα are highly emotional. For ἀμφιπλήκτων... κλύων 'in his isolation hearing the waves beating on the rocks', cf. *Ant.* 591–2 καὶ δυσάνεμοι | στόνωι βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἄκται and, *mutatis mutandis*, the figurative waves of ruin pounding Oidipous at *OC* 1240–4. βιοτὰν κατέσχευ 'kept his grip on life', cf. 175 ἀντέχει.

691 ἴν'... βάσιν 'where he was himself his own neighbour, not having (the power of) walking'. Cf. 500 καὐτὸν ἄγγελον, 568 αὐτάγγελος, 1378 πρὸς... τήνδε τ' ἔμπυον βάσιν. Contrast 1403.

692–5 οὐδέ... αἱματηρόν 'and not having any of those in the land as a neighbour to his evils, beside whom he might weep forth a groaning lament, evoking in response a groaning lament, bloody and deep-devouring'. The compression of meaning is extraordinary: there is no νόσον or similar word as an external obj. of ἀποκλαύσειεν, which would be parallel to the internal obj. στόνον; thus not only ἀντίτυπον 'evoking in response a groaning lament', but also βαρυβρῶτ' 'deep-devouring' and αἱματηρόν 'bloody' must modify στόνον by a bold transfer of epithets from what caused the lament to the lament itself. (Cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 793–4 νέικος ἀνδρῶν | ξύναιμον.) βαρυβρῶτ' thus combines in a single image the wound of Phil. (cf. 7 διαβόρωι) and the groan to which it gives rise. For αἱματηρόν describing a sound, cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 348 βλαχαί... αἱματοέσσαι, Eur. *El.* 752 φόνιον οἰωγῆν, *Trō.* 555–6 φοινία... βοά. Σ on 692 takes αἱματηρόν along with κακογείτονα as modifying στόνον and does not mention βαρυβρῶτ'.

τιν' ἐγγώρων need not mean that the Chorus think there actually are dwellers in other parts of Lemnos, i.e. that the island is not completely uninhabited. Cf. 2n.

κακογείτονα 'neighbour to (his) evils'. Cf. fr. 730b10 κακοπαθεὶ μῶρωι 'doom involving the suffering of evils', Aesch. *Pers.* 10 κακόμαντις 'prophetic of evils' (cf. *Il.* 1.106 μάντι κακῶν), *HH Hermes* 389 κακομήδεα 'devising evils'. In all these instances, κακο- represents a noun dependent on the verbal action implicit in the second part of the word. κακογείτονα also could, in principle, mean κακὸς γείτων 'a bad neighbour', but this would not make sense in the present passage. On the formation of compounds to which κακός contributes the first element, see Jebb *ad loc.*

696–700 οὐδ' . . . ἐλὼν 'nor who would put to sleep the burning-hot gush of blood oozing from the ulcers of his foot infested by a wild beast, if some (gush) should occur, with gentle herbs, having taken something from the nurturing earth'. Σ glosses αἱμάς (a word occurring only here) as τὴν τοῦ αἵματος ῥύσιν, 'the flowing of blood'. ἐμπίπτω 'occur', 'befall' is used intransitively by a wide variety of authors to denote the onset of a disease, physical symptoms, or an emotion, and is virtually a technical term in medical writers. Cf. *Tr.* 1253–4 πρὶν ἐμπεσεῖν | σπαραγμόν, *Il.* 14.207 χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ, Aesch. *Ag.* 341–2 ἔρως δὲ μὴ τις . . . ἐμπίπτῃ στρατῷ, Thuc. 2.49.4 λύγξ τε τοῖς πλεοσιν ἐνέπιπτε κενή, *Hp. On the Sacred Disease* 17 τὰ νοσήματα ἐς αὐτὸν ἐμπίπτειν φημί δξύτατα καὶ μέγιστα . . . , *Internal Affections* 27 ἐς τὸ ἥπαρ δδύνη δξείη ἐμπίπτει αὐτῷ.

700 φορβάδος . . . γᾶς: cf. 706 φορβάν . . . γᾶς, 392 παμβῶτι Γᾶ.

701–2 εἶρπε δ' . . . ἂν εἰλούμενος: cf. 290–1 with 289–92n., 294–5.

704–5a ὄθεν . . . πόρου 'from whence there might be an ease of resource'. ὄθεν picks up 701 ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαχῶι 'to one place at one time, another at another . . . , from whence . . . '. ἐξαλείη 'let up', cf. 639n.

708 αἶρων 'lifting', i.e. 'harvesting'. The Homeric formula ἄνδρες ἀλφισταί (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 770) means 'men who live from food produced by agricultural labour'. Phil. may find herbs growing wild on Lemnos, but part of what makes his existence there 'savage' is the lack of agriculture, one of the institutions basic to civilized human life. 'What "blooms" for him on this barren island is the "disease" itself (258–9), which cuts him off from civilized life and civilized food' (Segal 1981: 301).

710–12 πλὴν . . . φορβάν 'except if sometimes with winged arrows from (his) swift-shooting bow he should succeed in obtaining (ἀνύσειε) food for his belly'. Brunck's restoration of ἰοῖς remedies the awkward juxtaposition of πτανῶν (which would be a second, redundant adj. agreeing with τόξων) and πτανοῖς, understood substantively as 'birds'. On φορβάν, cf. 43–4n.

713–14 ὦ . . . ψυχά, | ὅς 'O, wretched life (of a man) who . . . '. By a kind of sense construction ὅς refers back to the idea of an individual man implicit in ψυχῇ, which denotes the 'life' of that man. ὅς μῆδ': for generic μῆ with causal force, cf. 170–1 with 170–2n. The implication is that the life is wretched *because* the man 'never enjoyed wine in a period of ten years, but always . . . '.

715 δεκέτει χρόνῳ 'in a ten-year time', i.e. 'in a period of ten years'. Cf. Moorhouse 87–8.

716–7 λεύσσω . . . προσενώμα 'he always (i.e. 'on every occasion') would direct his course toward a stagnant pool, looking wherever he could catch sight of one'. προσενώμα, which does not occur elsewhere, is intrans., cf. 168 ἐπινωμᾶν. So too is λεύσσω, which introduces the indir. question ὅπου γνοίη. Cf. *Aj.* 890 ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὅπου.

718–19 νῦν . . . παιδός 'but now having encountered the child of noble men', i.e. of the three generations including Achilles, Peleus, and Aiaikos. In prose, ὑπαντέω would take a dat. and mean 'having come on purpose to meet face

to face with'. Here it takes a gen., perhaps on the model of τυγχάνω, and has that verb's sense of randomness: 'having happened to meet face to face with', cf. *OC* 1445 μή ποτ' ἀντήσῃσι κακῶν. νῦν δέ may imply that the Chorus hear or see Phil. and Ne. leaving the cave, but need not mean that they therefore switch to language designed to help Ne. carry out Od.'s plot.

720 ἐκ κείνων: 'after and because of those things', cf. 1422 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τῶνδ'.

721–6 ὃς νιν . . . ὄχθαις 'who (another causal ὃς, cf. 684) on a sea-crossing wooden ship, in the fullness of many months, is bringing him to his ancestral home belonging to the Malian nymphs and by the banks of the Spercheios'. The proper noun and adj. (cf. 729 Οἶτος) are more than geographic: they vividly suggest the local topography and divinities in the same kind of language Phil. himself uses when he thinks of returning home (cf. 479, 490, 491, 492, 664) and when, at the end of the play, he bids farewell to the divinities and the physical features of Lemnos (cf. 1454, 1459, 1461, 1464). As far as the Chorus are concerned, Ne. is bringing (ἄγει) Phil. to Troy, and they are lying (or at least equivocating) in order to help him do so. Yet by bringing Phil. to Troy, Ne. will, in the long run, be bringing him home, so the Chorus speak more truly than they realize. Similarly, in 1471, the final line of the play, the Chorus call the voyage from Lemnos to Troy a νόστος, cf. 1469–71n.

ὃς is causal (cf. 684, 713): Phil. will be 'happy and great' at last, 'having encountered the child of noble men', *because* that child will bring him home. ποντοπόρῳ δούρατι: cf. *Il.* 15.704 νεὸς . . . ποντοπόροιο, *Aj.* 250 ποντοπόρῳ ναϊ. This is the only occurrence of the epic-Ionic form of Attic δόρυ in Soph., except for *Aj.* 211 δουριάλωτον, 894 δουρίληπτον; it is also the only Sophoklean example of δόρυ 'ship' (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 793), though δόρυ 'spear' is common, e.g. *Ant.* 195, *Tr.* 240, 478, *OC* 1304. πλήθει . . . μηνῶν 'in the fullness of many months'. For the indication of time by months, cf. *Ant.* 608–9 ἐτέων ἄκματοι | μῆνες. There is a kind of ambiguity in πλήθει . . . μηνῶν, because the phrase, like ἄγει, can refer to both the present and the future (oracular present, cf. 113n.).

727–9 ἴν' . . . ὄχθων 'where the bronze-shielded man drew near to the gods, (himself) a god all-bright in divine fire, above the heights of Oita'. These lines are conspicuously artful in their juxtaposition of ἀνὴρ with θεοῖς, verbal echoing in θεοῖς . . . θεὸς θείωι, audible repetition of θ, π, φ, and χ sounds, and use of ὄχθος from ὄχθη and ὄχθων from ὄχθος in successive lines. θείωι πυρί probably refers not only to the pyre lighted by Phil., but to the lightning of Zeus that accompanied Herakles' ascent to Olympos (cf. Diod. Sic. 4.38.4). Cf. *Tr.* 436–7 τοῦ κατ' ἄκρον Οἰταῖον νάπος | Διὸς καταστράπτοντος, which ironically foreshadows that same event. ὁ χάλκασπις ἀνὴρ suggests flashing from Herakles' bronze shield. Although he is usually represented in both visual art and literary texts with a bow or, later, a club, the shield is appropriate to the hero who sacked Oichalia *with the spear* (*Tr.* 478), which led to his death on the pyre on Mt Oita. Some vase paintings represent Her. as wearing armour, while being burned, and there

is archaeological evidence that bronze weapons – though not hoplite armour – were dedicated and burned with other offerings in his hero cult on Mt Oita from archaic Greek to Roman times (cf. Holt 1986: 303–6). For Her. as a kind of hoplite model for Phil. and Ne., cf. Vidal-Naquet 1988: 173–4. πλάθῃ is (historical) present, but aor. πλάθῃ, found in one MS, may be correct.

730–826: SECOND EPISODE

As Ne. and Phil. emerge from the cave and begin to move toward the *eisodos* leading to the ship, Phil. feels the onset of a painful attack, which by the end of the scene will leave him unable to stand upright (820). He tries to conceal it, but Ne. realizes what is happening (733–55). As Phil. suffers more pain and knows that he will collapse and lose consciousness, he entrusts the bow and arrows to Ne. (776), beseeching him as a suppliant not to abandon and betray him (757), not to go (789), not to leave him alone (809). The two strengthen their recently declared friendship (cf. 671–3n.) with gestures of solidarity, including the transfer of the bow and arrows (776–9) and a formal handshake as a pledge that Ne. will not abandon Phil. (813). In the course of the scene, Phil. first (776–8) instructs Ne. to pray that (divine) *phthonos* not make the bow painful to him as it was to its former masters (himself and Her.); then he experiences a mounting crisis of pain (783–90) that culminates in his wish at 791–5 that his own enemies might feel such pain themselves (cf. 314–16). Finally, as blood and pus burst from his foot and his agonized body is drenched in sweat, he falls into a deep sleep (821–6). The whole episode, coming at the mid-point of the play, is remarkable for its vivid representation of intense physical and psychological pain. Phil. sometimes expresses his agony by inarticulate cries – mere sounds of distress rather than normal human speech – and his articulated sentences have frequent asyndeta and jump suddenly from topic to topic. Ne. responds with a combination of pity, fear, and revulsion (e.g. 756–7, 806–8, 869–73). The scene ends with a six-line coda spoken by Ne. over Phil.'s collapsed body, which leads directly into the Chorus' invocation of Sleep as healer at the beginning of the subsequent *kommos* (827–31). The iambic trimeter dialogue is sometimes disrupted by *extra metrum* exclamations, by *antilabē*, and by passages of two or three lines that expand, as it were, into speeches by Phil. of 9, 11, and 24 verses (742–50, 763–73, 782–805). The trimeters are metrically unstable, with one example of middle caesura (737) and other unusual positions of word-end and metrical word-shape (see nn.). There also are multiple resolutions in the same or successive lines, including eight between 789 and 800, and multiple instances of *antilabē* in the same and successive lines (733, 753–4, 757, 810, 813–14, 816–17). Cf. Vasquez 1972: 481–3, 487–8, Budelmann 2006: 134–8, 2007: 445.

730–1 ἐρπ'...ἔχηι: as Ne. and Phil. come out of the cave, Phil. halts suddenly, and Ne., who has moved a few steps forward from the cave-mouth,

courteously encourages him to proceed (εἰ θέλεις, cf. 526 εἰ δοκεῖ) and asks why he is ‘silent for no reason’ (cf. LSJ *s.v.* λόγος III.1) and ‘held paralyzed’. For pass. ἔχη, cf. *Ant.* 1140–1 ὡς βιαίας ἔχεται | . . . πόλις ἐπὶ νόσου, *OC* 1025 γυνῶθι δ’ ὡς ἔχων ἔχη.

732 ἄ . . . ἄ: the first of many cries of pain in this scene that are ‘outside the metre’ (*extra metrum*), i.e. not part of any iambic trimeter. Cf. 732, 736, 739, 746, 750, 782, 785, 787, 790, 796. The cries express not only Phil.’s physical suffering, but his psychological anguish at being unable to conceal the outbreak of his disease, which might lead Ne. to renege on his promise to take him on board his ship. Cf. 742–3.

733 τί ἔστιν: for the hiatus, cf. 100n. τέκνον: in a scene of ninety lines, Phil. calls Ne. τέκνον ten times and παῖς four times, implying that their ‘parent-child’ relationship should lead Ne. not to forsake him. At 923, when he feels this relationship has been betrayed, Phil. no longer calls Ne. τέκνον but ξένη. Cf. 923–4n.

734 μῶν . . . νόσου ‘is it pain from the disease that is (constantly) present for you? (I hope not.)’ μῶν implies that Ne. at least hopes for a negative response to his question. τῆς παρεστῶσης νόσου (cf. 1340 τοῦ παρεστῶτος θέρους) also could mean ‘the disease that is now upon you’, cf. 765 τὸ πῆμα . . . τὸ νῦν παρόν, *OT* 633 τὸ νῦν παρεστὸς νεῖκος.

735 οὐ . . . δοκῶ ‘I (have pain)? No, not at all (δῆ), but just now I think I feel relief’. Intransitive κουφίζειν is rare (LSJ *s.v.* 1) and used primarily by medical writers, e.g. Hipp. *Aph.* 2.27 τοῖσιν μὴ . . . κουφίζουσιν, *Morb.* 3.16 τὰ δὲ ἀλγύματα . . . κουφίζει, *Epid.* 5.50 καὶ [αὕτη] ἐκουφίσθη.

736–7 ἰὼ θεοὶ . . . καλεῖς: ἰὼ θεοὶ forms an iambic metron but is *extra metrum*, cf. 219, 746. It is followed by a trimeter in which οὕτως ends at position 6, bisecting the line, which lacks word-end at both of the normal caesural positions. Cf. 101, 1369, *OT* 738 ὦ Ζεῦ, τί μου δρᾶσαι βεβούλευσαι πέρα; Some editors emend to eliminate the *extra metrum* exclamation and read, Φι. ὦ θεοί. Ne. τί τοὺς θεοὺς ὧδ’ ἀνασθενῶν καλεῖς; This requires that both θεοὶ and θεοὺς be pronounced as monosyllables, with synizesis of -εοί and -εοῦ, cf. 747, 195–6n.

738 σωτήρας . . . μολεῖν ‘that they come as saviours and kind towards us’, indir. discourse depending on καλῶ understood from 736 καλεῖς.

740–1 τί . . . σιγηλός: Ne.’s repeated questions reflect his impatience with Phil.’s silence.

741 φαίνην κυρῶν: cf. 544n.

742–50 Phil. expresses pain and dismay at having that pain revealed, and asks Ne. for relief, whatever the cost. His exclamations of self-pity and unarticulated cries of pain convey a degree of physical suffering beyond ordinary human endurance, which more formal language could not express. (Cf. Pucci 247, Knox 1964: 130–1.) The resolution in the *anceps* position at the beginning of 742, 745, and 749 and repeated διέρχεται in 743 and 744 reflect Phil.’s urgency

and helplessness. τέκνον in 742, 745 (twice), and 747, with 750 παῖ, indicate his desperate need to maintain his relationship with Ne., as he is swept away by the pain. Phil.'s 'unconventional cry of tragic suffering' in 745-6, παπαῖ, | ἀπαππαπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ παπαῖ (cf. 754, 785-6, 792-3), conspicuously reiterates sounds suggesting παῖς 'child' and πάππας 'papa' (Greengard 1987: 46).

743 ἀτταταῖ: a stronger expression of pain than ᾄ.

743-4 διέρχεται, διέρχεται: the subj. of the repeated verb can be understood from 742 as (τὸ) κακόν. Cf. Phil.'s wish at 791-2 that similar pain may transfix Od. (cf. Long 1968: 79). Although in 758 Phil. refers to the disease as αὐτή and in 807-8, as ἦδε, here he does not use a feminine pron. or adj. His language suggests a living force (fem. or neut.) that 'eats' and 'attacks' him (cf. 745, 786-7). ὦ: for the accent, see 254-6n.

745 βρύκομαι: cf. 7n., Tr. 987 (also of a 'devouring' νόσος). The word, which means 'chew and eat greedily and noisily,' is usually not tragic (Easterling 198), but vulgar and at home in comedy. It conveys not only Phil.'s physical suffering but his intense emotion. For the emotional effect of colloquial or comic language in tragedy, see 327n.

747 πρὸς θεῶν: θεῶν is scanned as a single syllable, with synizesis of εῶ, cf. 195-6n.

747-8 πρόχειρον . . . χεροῖν lit. 'if any sword, handy, is present in your two hands'. πρόχειρον 'handy' is an anticipatory (and hence emphatic) pred. adj., modifying ξίφος. Cf. Eur. *El.* 696 πρόχειρον ἔγχος χειρὶ βασιτάζουσ' ἔμῃ. At 1204-9, Phil. asks the Chorus for a sword, an axe, or some other weapon with which to commit suicide. πάρα = πάρεστιν.

748 πάταξον . . . ποδά 'strike at the (topmost) end of my foot', i.e. cut my foot off at the ankle. Cf. 824 ἄκρου . . . ποδός, Finglass 2009a: 223-4.

750 ἴθ' is hortatory with ὦ παῖ, cf. *OT* 1468-9 ἴθ' ὦναξ, | ἴθ' ὦ γονῆι γενναῖε. Contrast Phil.'s ἴθ' in 733, which merely tells Ne. to 'keep going'.

750-5 Ne. cannot understand what is happening to Phil., and Phil. cannot understand how this is possible. For the hiatus in τί ἔστιν, cf. 100 with n., 733, 917.

οὕτω νεοχμόν ἐξαίφνης 'thus suddenly new (and unexpected)'. The adverbs strengthen νεοχμόν, which, like νέον, νεώτερον, or καινόν, can imply something negative or even sinister. Cf. 51-3n.

ὅτου . . . ποῆι: lit. 'in regard to which you make so much howling and groaning over yourself'. ὅτου is causal gen., with νεοχμόν [πράγμα] as antecedent; σουτοῦ is obj. gen. governed by ὑγῆν καὶ στόνον. The transmitted πο(ι)εῖς στόνον would mean 'you make (i.e. 'cause') groaning (in others)'.

οἶσθ' . . . οἶσθ': the triple change of speakers in a single line (753) effectively expresses the speakers' emotion and impatience, as does Phil.'s triple use of οἶσθα in response to Ne.'s οὐκ οἶδα (753-4).

τοὔπισαγμα is crasis of τὸ ἐπίσαγμα. The word literally means a burden carried by a pack-animal (cf. ἐπισάττειν 'put a load on an animal', 'saddle a horse') and is used figuratively of the 'burden' of Phil.'s disease, which makes him less than human. νόσημα 'sickness', a more specifically medical term

than νόσος, is used figuratively of Oidipous' condition at *OT* 1293 and elsewhere of personal and political woes, e.g. Aesch. *PV* 224–5 τοῦτο τῇι τυραννίδι | νόσημα. It is more abstract than νόσος and, like other -μα nouns, suggests the result of an action (here, implicitly, νοσέω). Cf. 265–7n., Long 1968: 78–9.

756 γάρ: in stichomythia, γάρ often introduces a statement echoing and giving a reason for what was just said, cf. 1234, *GP* 86–8. This use of γάρ is slightly different from its use, e.g. in 1280, to *imply* assent while giving, often elliptically, the reason for the assent.

757 τί . . . δράσω: deliber. subjunct. Ne. is constantly asking this and similar questions of himself and others, e.g. 54, 100, 895, 908 with 908–9 n., 974, 1393. Cf. the Chorus at 963, Phil. at 1063, 1350.

758–9 ἦκει . . . ἐξεπλήσθη 'for she [lit. 'this female'] arrives after a period of time, perhaps when she has been fully sated with (her) wanderings'. Phil. habitually speaks of his disease as something separate from himself, with which he must live, cf. 268, 1022. αὐτή has no feminine antecedent, except perhaps the idea of νόσος in 755 νοσήματος. Cf. 807–8 ἦδε . . . ὄξεϊα φοιτᾷ καὶ ταχῆϊ ἄπέρχεται, *Tr.* 980–1 φοιτᾶδα δεινὴν | νόσον, *Tr.* 987 ἄ δ' αὖ μισὰρὰ βρύκει. The ἐχίδνα whose bite caused the disease is also distinctively female, cf. 265–7n.

πλάνοις may have a specifically medical resonance: at Hipp. *Epid.* 1.6 πλάνητες 'wanderers' are 'intermittent fevers', and this medical meaning may even be related to the appearance of πλάνης rather than πλάνοις in some MSS. Cf. Aesch. *PV* 275–6 πλανωμένη . . . πημονή, Pl. *Tim* 88e2 τὰ τε περὶ τὸ σῶμα πλανώμενα παθήματα. **ἐξεπλήσθη. ἰὼ ἰώ:** there is double hiatus in three successive words, with synizesis in the first ἰώ, (-σθη, ἰὼ ἰώ). (Or one could scan the interjections ἰὼ ἰώ, with resolution of the expected heavy syllable at position 6, and -ώ as a light syllable before i- by epic correction.) The hiatus between ἐξεπλήσθη and ἰώ is unparalleled in extant tragic trimeters, but it is appropriate in a verse divided between two speakers, where there is a strong sense break at the end of the first speaker's words (at the caesura), and the next speaker begins with an emotional interjection.

759–60 ἰὼ ἰώ . . . φανείς 'oh, oh wretched (are) you, | shown to be wretched indeed through all your toils'. σύ is predicate and is made emphatic by its position at the end of 759, after the first δύστηνε. The second δύστηνε is a predicate adj. attracted into the voc. (Moorhouse 30, *SCG* 1: 8–9); it is strengthened by δῆτα and agrees with the voc. participle φανείς. Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 674 ὦ πολύκαυτε φίλοισι θανών. The repetition of δύστηνε, the resolution at position 6, and emphatic δῆτα (*GP* 277) forcefully express Ne.'s sympathy for Phil., cf. 1348–9.

[761] There is no line 761, owing to an error in the standard numbering of the lines of the play. For an explanation of this error, see Jebb 1898: 241.

762 βούληι . . . τί σου lit. 'do you wish I should take hold of you, then, and touch you in some respect'? English has no idiomatic way of rendering τι, an adv. acc. of respect modifying θίγω. βούληι λάβωμαι is a combination of two originally separate questions – the first in the indic., the second in the subjunct.

θίγω is in the same paratactic relation to βούληι as λάβωμαι. Cf. Eur. *Or.* 218 βούληι θίγω σου.

763–73 Phil., temporarily free from excruciating pain, entrusts the bow to Ne. for safe-keeping, should Od. and Diomedes arrive, while he recovers from his paroxysm. He knows from experience that sleep will follow the attack and that only in this way can the pain cease (768–9). The transfer of the bow marks the moment of Ne.’s (and Od.’s) success: Phil. does not realize that in trusting his new friend with the bow, so that it will not fall into Od.’s hands, he actually is giving it to Od. At the same time, however, the trust Phil. shows, in giving Ne. the bow, helps Ne. to understand that he cannot simply take it and leave.

763 μή . . . τοῦτό γ’ understand λάβει, θίγηις, or ποιήσῃς.

763–6 ἀλλά μοι . . . φύλασσε lit. ‘but having taken the bow for me, this one here, as you were asking me just now [cf. 656–7], keep (it) safe and guard (it), until this pain of the disease – the one now present – lets up’. ἀλλά is both adversative and hortatory; μοι is ethical dative, cf. 22, 98n. For ἔως ἀνῆι without ἄν, see *Aj.* 555, *Tr.* 148–9; cf. 917 πρὶν μάθῃς, *GMT* §620, 648. For intrans. ἀνῆι, cf. 639, 705 ἐξάνειν, 767 ἐξίηι. The transfer of the bow is opposed to (and may be seen as a substitution for) the touch of Ne. that Phil. refuses (cf. Kaimio 1988: 23). Such physical contact ‘would be an admission of a fundamental type of weakness, a variation of the moral and feminized weakness exhibited by Orestes in *Orestes*, Herakles in *Trachiniae*, and Pentheus in *Bacchae*’, when they permit themselves to be touched by other males (Kosak 1999: 124). Cf. 814–18 with n. Phil. accepts Ne.’s physical assistance for the first time either at 893–4 (cf. 894–7n.) or at 1403, at both of which moments Ne. will have proved himself a φίλος, and among φίλοι such physical contact was acceptable by late fifth-century Athenian cultural standards. Cf. Eur. *Her.* 1398, 1402–3. τὸ πῆμα . . . τῆς νόσου: cf. *Aj.* 363 τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης, Aesch. *Ag.* 850 πῆμα’ . . . νόσου, *Od.* 3.152 πῆμα κακοῖο.

766 γὰρ οὖν: cf. 298, 298–300n.

768 λήξαι: the subj. of the inf. is με understood from 767 μ’, as Σ implies by τῆς δόδνης παύσασθαι πρότερον πρὶν κοιμηθῆναι. It also would be possible to understand τὸ κακόν from 767 as the subj. of λήξαι, but understood με must be the subj. of 769 εὔδειν, and it would be awkward to understand a different, unexpressed subj. between 767 μ’ and εὔδειν.

769 ἐκλον εὔδειν ‘that I sleep at my ease’, supplying με as subj. of εὔδειν from 767 μ’ (see previous n.). (μ’ is actually found after εὔδειν in one MS, doubtless an attempt to provide an explicit subj. for the inf.) Triklinios’ εὔκλον for ἐκλον is presumably based on *Od.* 14.479 εὔδον δ’ εὔκλοι (or a similar association of these words in some text that is no longer extant). This epic form is found elsewhere in tragedy only at *El.* 241 ξυνναίσιμ’ εὔκλος and Eur. *Id.* 644 ὥς οὐ βλέπεις εὔκλον ἄσμενος μ’ ἰδών (where some editors emend to ἐκλον). τῶιδε τῶι χρόνῳ: for the dat., cf. 715n.

770 ἐκείνοι: Od. and Diomedes, cf. 570–1. The pron. may be disparaging (cf. 622 κείνος), as οὗτος frequently is, e.g. *OT* 429 ἢ ταῦτα δῆτ' ἀνεκτὰ πρὸς τούτου κλύειν, *El.* 675 μὴ ταύτης κλύε.

771 ἐκόντα μήτ' ἄκοντα: understand σε as subj. of 772 μεθεῖναι. For omission of μήτε before ἐκόντα, cf. *Ant.* 267 βουλευσάντι μήτ' εἰργασμένωι, Aesch. *Ag.* 532 Πάρις γὰρ οὔτε συντελὴς πόλις. μήτε τωι τέχνῃ 'and not by any means'. Cf. *Aj.* 752 παντοῖαι τέχνῃ 'by every means', LSJ s.v. τέχνη 1.3. Here,

however, τέχνῃ has a special resonance of 'craft', 'trickery', especially for Ne. and the audience, who know about the δόλος. Indefinite τωι precedes the noun with which it agrees, owing to the tendency in Greek and some other Indo-European languages for enclitics to come second in their sentence or clause (or third after particles or other enclitics), regardless of sense or syntactic function. Cf. 519 μὴ νῦν μὲν τις εὐχέρης, *Aj.* 29 καὶ μοί τις ὀπτῆρ, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 10–11.

773 κἀμ' is crasis of καὶ ἐμέ and emphatic by its position at the beginning of the line in enjambment. πρόστροπον 'suppliant'. This rare (and, therefore, strong) word occurs only here and at *OT* 41. Cf. 930 τὸν προστρόπαιον, τὸν ἰκέτην.

774 προνοίας οὔνεκ' 'on account of (my) foresight', i.e. 'as far as my foresight goes'. One MS has γ' after προνοίας, which would be normal Sophoklean usage, e.g. *OT* 857–8 μαντείας γ' . . . οὔνεκ', *El.* 387 τοῦδε γ' οὔνεκ', 605 τοῦδε γ' οὔνεκα; but cf. *El.* 787 ἀπειλῶν οὔνεχ'. Ne. equivocates: his 'foresight' aims not only to preserve the bow for Phil. but to steal it for Od. οὐ δοθήσεται: the asyndeton (γάρ would be expected) and fut. pass. give Ne.'s words a solemn tone.

775 ξὺν τύχῃ . . . πρόσφερε 'but give (it) (and) with good luck', cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 138 σὺν τύχῃ τινί, Pl. *Symp.* 177e5 ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.

776 ἰδοῦ, δέχου 'look, (here it is), receive it'. As he speaks, Phil. extends the bow to Ne., inviting him to take it; cf. 763–6n. For ἰδοῦ (aor. mid. imper.) connoting compliance with a command or request (and accompanied by a significant gesture or stage action), cf. *Aj.* 346, *Tr.* 1184. This colloquialism occurs over 20x in Eur. and over 40x in Ar.; cf. Stevens 1976: 35, Collard 2005: 363 (with further references). τὸν . . . πρόσκυσον: 'kiss the ground before (i.e., 'pay due reverence to') (divine) jealousy'. In fifth-century literature φθόνος often denotes a tendency on the part of divinity to begrudge, limit, reduce, or punish any prosperity or success that might seem more than humanly appropriate. Cf. Hdt. 1.32.1 τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἔον φθονερόν τε καὶ ταρχώδες . . . ἀνθρωπηῶν πρηγμάτων πέρι. It was sometimes thought that those who were exceptionally prosperous or successful could avoid φθόνος through apotropaic words or gestures. For Phil., possession of Herakles' talismanic bow, which Ne. speaks of as deserving reverence (657), constitutes a more than human prosperity; he implies that his own suffering, like that of Her. before him, resulted from 'divine jealousy', which he graciously and apotropaically wishes that Ne. may avoid. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 904 φθόνος δ' ἀπέστω, Pind. *Isthm.* 7.39 ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος | ὃ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον. The goddess

Nemesis, also called Adrasteia, was conceived of similarly: cf. Aesch. *PV* 936 οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τὴν Ἀδράστειαν σοφοί, *Pl. Rep.* 451a4.

777 μή σοι . . . ὅπως: μή . . . γενέσθαι depends on the idea of prayer in 776 πρόσκυσον. πολὺπονα ‘bringing many toils’ is pred. adj. modifying αὐτά. With μηδ’ ὅπως, understand ἐγένετο. For ὅπως used like ὥς in comparisons, see *LSJ s.v.* ὅπως A.I.4.

779–81 Ne. is again vague and ambiguous regarding the destination of their voyage, cf. 528–9. For εὐστολής ‘fast’, cf. 516 εὐστόλου with 510–18n. For the synizesis in θεοί, cf. 196, 433, 747n. Ne.’s use of the dual is also ambiguous: on the one hand, it is strategic and persuasive, since Phil. will understand it as referring to Ne. and himself; on the other hand, the audience might hear it as Ne.’s prayer for his own and Od.’s success (cf. 25n., 539–41n., 627n., Hahnemann 2011). δικαιοῖ ‘considers just’, ‘makes just’ is self-serving (and rather Odyssean) in its implication that ‘justice’ is manipulable rather than absolute. Cf. Pind. fr. 169a.1–4 νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς | . . . | ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον | ὑπερτάται χειρί.

782–803 Phil., in excruciating pain, renews his curse on Od. and the sons of Atreus (cf. 314–16) and appeals to Death and Ne. to free him from his suffering.

782–82a ἄ ἄ ἄ . . . (τύχη): the transmitted text in most MSS consists of an isolated dochmiac dimeter, ἀλλὰ δέδοικ’, ὦ παῖ, μή μ’ ἄτελής εὐχή, in a scene otherwise consisting only of iambic trimeters. This anomaly is unparalleled, and even though it might possibly seem consistent with other metrical and stylistic anomalies in the scene (cf. introductory comment on 730–826), Wunder and most later editors rightly emend to produce a trimeter. Philp 1958: 220 ingeniously takes ἀλλὰ as the corruption of a fourfold cry of pain *extra metrum*, following 781, cf. 732, 739. μ’ in the transmitted text is unlikely to be correct: Phil. should be speaking more generally, because Ne. has prayed for a good voyage for both of them (cf. 779 νῶιν). ἄτελής is pred. adj., agreeing with εὐχή. Cf. *Od.* 17.546 τῷ κε καὶ οὐκ ἄτελής θάνατος μνηστῆρσι γένοιτο.

783–4 σταζει . . . νέον ‘for again this dark red blood drips, oozing from the depths, and I look for something new’ (i.e. ‘something worse’). Cf. 696–7, 751n.

786–8 ὦ πούς . . . ἐγγύς: Phil. speaks to his foot in the fut. tense (‘such evils you will work on me’) when he thinks of the pain as coming from within; when he thinks of it as coming from outside, he switches to the neut. (‘this thing’) and to the more vivid present to describe its approach.

788 οἶμοι . . . τάλας: for the nom. in an exclamation characterizing the speaker, cf. 254, *Tr.* 1046–7 ὦ πολλὰ δὴ καὶ θερμὰ κού λόγῳ κακὰ | καὶ χερσὶ καὶ νώτοισι μοχθήσας ἐγώ. Cf. *SCG* 1. 3–4.

789 ἐχετε τὸ πρᾶγμα ‘you have the whole matter’, i.e. ‘you know everything (that I was trying to conceal)’.

791–2 ὦ . . . ἦδε ‘O Kephallenian “guest-friend”, I wish this feeling of pain would grip you, straight through your breast.’ ξέβε is ironic, since Od. is anything but a friend, and the ‘gift’ Phil. wishes him is anything but friendly, even

though it would reciprocate what Od. has given him. For *Κεφαλήν*, cf. 264 with n. *ἦδε* is emphatic by its placement at the end of the sentence and at position 9, where a strong sense-break is rare. Prepositional *διαμπερές* + gen. is Homeric, eg. *Il.* 12.429 *διαμπερές ἀσπίδος*, 20.362 *ἀλλὰ μάλα στιχὸς εἰμι διαμπερές*. *ἄλγησις* ‘denotes the present condition of feeling pain’, like other *-σις* nouns which normally signify an ongoing process rather than a result of verbal action (Long 1968: 132, cf. 15–18). For the only other extant occurrence of *ἄλγησις* in the classical period, cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 146–7 *ὦ πρέσβυ, πρέσβυ, τοῦ φθόνου μὲν τὸν ψόγον | ἤκουσα, τὴν δ’ ἄλγησιν οὐ παρεσχόμεν*, a paratragic passage ‘in which the affected diction and absurd antithesis mark the passage as parody’ and imply that for Ar.’s audience, *ἄλγησις* was a word associated with tragedy, specifically with the Gorgianic Agathon (Handley 1954: 135).

793 *παπαῖ μάλ’ αὐθις*: cf. *OT* 1316–17 *οἱμοι, | οἱμοι μάλ’ αὐθις*, Aesch. *Ag.* 1345 *ὦμοι μάλ’ αὐθις*.

793–5 *ὦ διπλοῖ... Ἀγάμεμνον... νόσον*: cf. 264, 314 16. The repeated interjection and double apostrophe (with nominative followed by vocatives) reflect Phil.’s strong emotion, as do the three resolutions in two lines, two in proper names and one in an *anceps* syllable at the beginning of 794; cf. 730 826n., 931 3n. *διπλοῖ* = *δύο* is common in tragedy, cf. *Aj.* 960, *Ant.* 51, *OT* 20. For *πῶς ἂν* + opt. in a wish, cf. 531–2, 1214, *OC* 1457–8 *πῶς ἂν, εἰ τις ἔντοπος, | τὸν... δεῦρο Θησέα πόροι*.

797–8 *ὦ Θάνατε... ποτε*: cf. *Aj.* 854 *ὦ Θάνατε Θάνατε*, Aesch. fr. 255 (from *Philoketes*) *ὦ Θάνατε παιῶν*. *οὕτω κατ’ ἡμαρ* is felt first with *αἰε* *καλούμενος*, then with *οὐ δύνῃ*. Cf. *OC* 681–3 *θάλλει... κατ’ ἡμαρ αἰεῖ | νάρκισσος*.

799–801 *ὦ τέκνον... ὦ γενναῖ* ‘o my child, my noble (child), but take (me) and in this fire which is famously called Lemnian, burn (me), o noble one’. *με* is omitted with both *συλλαβῶν* and *ἐμπρησον*, but *συλλαβῶν* suggests *με* and ‘excuses its absence’ (Jebb); cf. 769n., 1368. Phil. again invokes Ne. as his ‘child’, and *γενναῖον* and *γενναῖ* appeal persuasively to Ne.’s sense of his ‘noble’ heritage. Od. speaks similarly at 3–4, 51, when he wants Ne. to do as he wishes. Cf. 475, 1068, 1310–13, 1402. *ἀλλά... ἐμπρησον*: *ἀλλά* is hortatory, cf. 230n., 950. For *ἀνακαλουμένω* ‘famously called’, see LSJ s.v. *ἀνακαλέω* II.3, though perhaps the meaning here is ‘prayed to’ (Burkert 1970: 5). *Λήμιον* *πῦρ* was proverbial for a ‘fierce fire’, e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 299, Bacchyl. 18.55. The phrase may originally have referred to the volcanic Mt Mosychlos, on the east side of Lemnos, not far from the site of Phil.’s cave; it would have suggested to an Athenian audience the story of the Lemnian women murdering their husbands (cf. Hdt. 6.138.4, Hesych. λ 871–4, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 631–8) or perhaps a local ritual. See Burkert 1970: 5–6, Martin 1987: 95–7, Masciadri 2008: 244–8.

801–3 *κἀγὼ τοι... δρᾶν* ‘I too, you know, once thought it right to do this to the son of Zeus in return for these weapons, which you now keep safe.’ For double

acc. with δρᾶν, cf. 918. As in 667–70, Phil. emphasizes the parallel between Ne. and himself: he gained the weapons by heroically lighting Herakles' pyre, when that hero was suffering extreme pain, just as Ne. now possesses them through kindness to Phil. in a similar situation. Cf. 664–6n.

804–5 τί φήεις... κυρεῖς: as at 220–31, Ne. remains silent in the face of Phil.'s urgent questions. There he was shocked by the first sight of Phil.; here he is perhaps moved by Phil.'s parallel between his own relation to Her. and Ne.'s relation to Phil. himself. ποῦ ποτ'... κυρεῖς: figurative, 'where in the world are you (in your thoughts)?' (At *El.* 1409, the same words are meant literally.)

806 ἄλγῳ... κακά 'I have long been feeling grief, groaning for the evils that are on you,' a sympathetic response to the four emotional questions that Phil. asks in 804–5. πάλαι, like other expressions of time and place, often depends for its meaning on the perspective, attitude, or rhetorical strategy of the speaker: it can refer to a time as long ago as ten years, e.g. 1030 καὶ τέθνηκ' ὑμῖν πάλαι, or a comment earlier in the same conversation. Cf. 589, 906, 913, 966.

807 καὶ... ἴσχ' 'have courage too' (as well as grief).

807–8 ὥς... ἀπέρχεται 'as she [lit. 'this female'] comes to me sharply and departs swiftly'. The adverbs in this translation are pred. adjectives in Greek, agreeing with ἦδε, which looks back to 795 τήνδε τήν νόσον. Cf. 526, 1080. Phil. tries to reassure Ne. in 807–8 that his attack will be brief, in contrast to 806 πάλαι, the 'long time' during which Ne. 'feel[s] grief' on his behalf (806). μοι is dat. of the 'person interested' (for good or ill), sometimes called the dat. of advantage or disadvantage; cf. Smyth §§1481–5, Moorhouse 84–5.

809–10 ἀλλ'... φρόνει: ἀλλά is hortatory (cf. 230n., 799, 950), as Phil. follows the explanation of how his disease comes and goes with a supplication that is all the more powerful for being brief. ἀντιάζω 'encounter someone face to face' can have the special sense 'approach as a suppliant', 'entreat', with or without the acc. of the person encountered; cf. *Aj.* 492, *OT* 192, *El.* 1009. Perhaps Phil. kneels and tries to touch Ne.'s knees in a ritual gesture of supplication (cf. Gould 2001: 26–7), but if he does so, it is not clear that he succeeds. Their first certain contact is the handshake at 813.

811–13 οὐ μὴν... μενεῖν: Phil. implies that it would be inappropriate to ask his φίλος and 'child' to swear that he will not abandon him, but demands a handshake as a physical pledge, which Ne. grants. μὴν standing alone, without another particle, is relatively rare (*GP* 331); here it is both emphatic, like δὴ or τοι, and adversative: 'but (it would be wrong, so) I do not think it right to put you on oath'. Cf. *OC* 650 οὗτοι σ' ὑφ' ὅρκου γ' ὥς κακὸν πιστώσομαι. ὥς... γ' 'know that it is not (religiously) lawful for me to go without you' – another ambiguous statement, which might mean either that Ne. would violate his sworn loyalty to Phil. were he to leave, or that he would fail in his duty to Od. and the Greek army, should he do so, or both. For ὥς... γ', see 117n. For ἐμοῦστι, an unusual crasis of ἐμοῦ and ἐστι, cf. *Aj.* 1225 μοῦστι. ἐμβαλλε...

πίστιν: for a handshake as a pledge of *φιλία*, cf. *Tr.* 1181 *ἐμβαλλε χεῖρα δεξιάν, OC* 1632 *δός μοι χερὸς σῆς πίστιν ἀρχαίαν*, Aischines 3.224 *καὶ τὴν δεξιάν ἐνέβαλες ἄνδρα φίλον καὶ ξένον ποιοῦμενος*.

814–18 Phil., having received Ne.'s pledge to stay, surrenders himself to the attack, which must be understood to strike him fully between lines 813 and 814, before he speaks the words *ἐκέισε νῦν μ'*, *ἐκέισε* (Mastronarde 1979: 66, Telò 2001: 237). Perhaps the actor mimics a person having an epileptic seizure: descriptions of madness and physical suffering in Soph. and the other tragic poets often resemble accounts of 'the sacred disease' in medical texts (Vasquez 1972: 433–47). *ἐκέισε . . . ἐκέισε* and *ἄνω* probably refer to Phil.'s gazing and gesturing toward the sky (815), toward a place 'not of this world' (Reinhardt 1979: 180), though many interpreters think that he looks and points toward the cave and moves as if to ascend the cliff (cf. Telò 2001: 237–8n.20). In either case, Ne. does not understand Phil.'s words and at first tries to prevent him from leaving by blocking his way (815–16), but when Phil. insists on going (816–17), Ne. allows him to do so (818), only to see Phil. collapse utterly in 819–20. There is no actual contact between the two, except for their handshake at 813: the three instances of *μέθες* in 816 are demands by Phil. that Ne. get out of his way, and 817 *οὐ φημ' ἑάσειν* and 818 *καὶ δὴ μεθίημ'* indicate, respectively, Ne.'s initial refusal to do so and then his acquiescence. For detailed reconstruction of the staging, see Telò 2001: 237–8. The scene could also be played with Ne. actually putting his hands on Phil. to restrain him, then releasing him in 818, but this would ignore Phil.'s earlier insistence on not being touched (cf. 763) and Ne.'s clear reluctance to touch him, even in order to help him rise from his position of supplication (cf. 507–18n.). Physical contact between the two, except for the handshake at 813, is avoided at least until 894 and possibly until 1403. Cf. Goldhill 2012: 69–73. In Athenian culture there was a general inhibition against one free, citizen male touching another (cf. Dem. 22.33–5), as such contact could be seen as an assertion of sexual dominance (Winkler 1990: 48) or social superiority (Kosak 1999: 96–9). *τί . . . κύκλον* 'why are you outside of your mind again? Why do you look at the vault (of heaven) above?' Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 232 *τί τόδ' αὖ παραφῶρων*, Eur. *Ion* 1147 *ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ*, Hdt. 1.131.2 *τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. The two resolutions in Ne.'s question at 815, followed by Phil.'s *ἀπὸ μ' ὀλέεις* in 817, reflect both men's excitement and urgency. Cf. Phil. in 923–4. *ἀπὸ μ' . . . προσθήγης:* cf. 762–3, *Tr.* 1007–8. Tmesis of *ἀπὸ* and other prepositional prefixes is common in Sophoklean lyric, e.g. 1158, 1177, but relatively rare in dialogue; cf. *Ant.* 432–3 *σὺν δέ νιν | θηρώμεθ'*.

818 *καὶ . . . φρονεῖς* 'I am letting you go, if you are now somewhat more rational.' Ne. uses *δή* twice, each time with a different force: *καὶ δὴ*, as often, introduces a present-tense response to a definite command that uses the same word as that command (*μεθίημ'* echoes 816 *μέθες*, *μέθες με . . . μέθες ποτέ*, cf. *GP* 251–2); the second *δή* is emphatic, as often in conditional protases, cf. *Tr.* 26–7 *τέλος δ' ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀγώνιος καλῶς, | εἰ δὴ καλῶς* (*GP* 223–4).

819 ὦ γαῖα . . . ἔχω 'O Earth, receive me, dying, just as I am.' θανάσιμ is 'proleptic', i.e. it precedes μ', the word it modifies as predicate adj., and thus gains emphasis. θανάσιμον often means 'fatal' or 'associated with death', but also can mean 'close to death' (cf. Pl. *Rep.* 408b9) or, as here, 'dead'. Cf. *Aj.* 516-17 καὶ μητέρ' ἄλλη μοῖρα τὸν φύσαντά τε | καθείλεν Αἰδου θανάσιμους οἰκήτορας, *O.* 959 εὖ ἴσθ' ἐκείνον θανάσιμον βεβηκότα. ὅπως ἔχω gives θανάσιμον more pathos and pathos.

820 οὐκέτ' . . . ἔα 'no longer lets me be erect', i.e. 'stand upright'.

821-5 Ne.'s vivid description of Phil.'s horrendous attack awakens sympathy by its account of his physical helplessness and loss of normal bodily control. τόδε at the end of 822 in effect means 'look here' and implies a deictic gesture towards Phil., now lying on the ground.

οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου: gen. of time within which, cf. *OC* 397 ἤξοντα βαιοῦ κοῦχί μυρίου χρόνου.

Ἰδρὼς γέ . . . φλέβ' 'yes, sweat is pouring down him over (his) whole body, and a vein bursting with blood has broken from the uppermost end of his foot'. αἱμορραγῆς is *haimorrhagē* in extant Greek literature, but αἱμορραγέω, αἱμορραγία, etc. occur in medical writers (see LSJ *s.v.*); cf. Hipp. *Vid. Ac.* [Περὶ ὀψίος] 3 μὴ ῥαγῇ αἷμα. Medical writers also speak of φλέβες αἱμορροῖδες, veins 'liable to discharge blood' (e.g. Hipp. *Aph.* 5.24), and a vein or veins 'flowing with blood' (e.g. Hipp. *Morb.* 1.3 φλέβα αἱμόροον). The combination γέ τοι 'giv[es] a reason, valid so far as it goes, for accepting a proposition' (*GP* 550) – here, the assertion in 821-2 that sleep will soon take hold of Phil. γάρ in 822 introduces a stronger confirmation of this proposition, cf. *GP* 550. ἄκρου . . . ποδός is gen. of separation, cf. 748n. 823 νιν is acc. obj. of καταστάζει, and πᾶν . . . δέμας is acc. of respect, in a kind of 'whole'-part construction, in which one acc. (νιν) refers to the person, the other to the part especially affected by the action (πᾶν . . . δέμας). Cf. Smyth §985, §160in.

826 ἐκηλον . . . πέσῃ: cf. 768-9 ἔαν χρέων | ἐκηλον εὐδειν.

827-864: KOMMOS

The *kommos*, in place of an expected second stasimon, consists of a metrical triad sung by the Chorus to Ne. over the sleeping Phil., with four hexameters (839-42) chanted by Ne. as a kind of *mesode* between the strophe and antistrophe. At the end of the stasimon (719-29), the Chorus sang of Phil. returning home to Oita 'happy and great', with the help of Ne., and of his association with the apotheosized Herakles. Here, however, after calling on Sleep to come to Phil. as a gentle healer (826-31), they urge Ne. to take advantage of the opportunity (cf. 837 καίρως, 862 καίρῳ) to steal the bow and leave (833-8, 843-54), while Phil. is 'stretched out like someone in Hades, with no power of hand, foot, or anything' (859-60). This is 'one of the harshest discords in Greek poetry' (Winnington-Ingram 1980: 287): the Chorus, despite the sympathy with Phil.'s suffering that they express in the *parodos* and stasimon, give no sign of having been affected by his shattering paroxysm; their pragmatic opportunism marks them as even more

unwaveringly devoted to the success of Od.'s plan than is Ne. As in the *parodos* and their later lyric exchange with Phil. at 1081–1217, their main concern is the interest of their master (Kirkwood 1954: 5). Their opportunistic involvement in the action and readiness to steal Phil.'s bow and leave without him are grounded in their naïve devotion to his success, but their personal stake in this success is clear from the dative of advantage in 828, the ethical datives in 832 and 850, and *ἐμᾷ φροντίδι* in 863. Here as elsewhere in the play, they have no moral scruples about deceiving Phil., whom they have repeatedly said they pity. They end both the strophe and the antistrophe by vaguely leaving open the possible results of either action or inaction, and in the concluding epode their emphasis on the *πόνος* that is *κράτιστος* (864) unknowingly anticipates the appearance of Her., *par excellence* the man of *πόνος*, in the final scene (cf. 1419, 1422).

Metre: strophe and antistrophe

827	᾿Υπν' ὀδύννας ἀδαής, ᾿Υπνε δ' ἀλγέων	dactyl tetram
843	ἀλλά, τέκνον, τάδε μὲν θεὸς ὀψεται·	
828–9	εὐαῆς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις, (εὐαίων,) dochm dim	
844	ὦν δ' ἂν (κ)ἀμείβηι μ' αὐθις, βαίαν μοι,	
830	εὐαίων, ὦναξ· ὀμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις dochm dim	
845–6	βαίαν, ὦ τέκνον, πέμπε λόγων φῆμαν·	
831	τάνδ' αἶγλαν, ἅ τέταται τανῦν. mol + dochm	
847	ὥς πάντων ἐν νόσωι εὐδρακῆς	
832	ἴθι ἴθι μοι Παιών. dochm	
848	ὑπνος αὐπνος λεύσσειν.	
833	ὦ τέκνον, ὄρα ποῦ στάσηι, iamb + mol	
849	ἀλλ' ὅτι δύναι μάκιστον	
834	ποῖ δὲ βάσηι, πῶς δὲ μοι τάντεϋθεν iamb + cr + mol (?)	
850	κεῖνο (δῆ) μοι, κεῖνό <μοι> λαθραίως	
835	φροντίδος. ὀρᾷς ἦδη. cr.+ mol.(?)	
851	ἐξιδού ὅπως πράξεις.	
836	πρὸς τί μένομεν πράσσειν; cr. + mol. (?)	
852	οἴσθα γὰρ δὴν αὐδῶμαι.	

837	καίρὸς τοι πάντων γνώμαν ἴσχων	3 mol
853	εἰ ταῦτ' ἀν τούτῳ γνώμαν ἴσχεις,	
838	ᾠ (πολύ τι) πολὺ παρὰ πόδα κράτος ἄρνυται.	dochm dim
854	μάλα τοι ἄπορα πυκινοῖς ἐνιδεῖν πάθη.	
839–42		dactyl hexam
<i>Metre: epode</i>		
855–7	οὐρός τοι, τέκνον, οὐρός· ἀνὴρ	hipponact
	δ' ἀνόμματος, οὐδ' ἔχων ἄρωγάν,	tel + — —
858	ἐκτέταται νύχιος—	D
859	ἀλεῆς ὕπνος ἐσθλός—	?
860	οὐ χερὸς, οὐ ποδὸς, οὐ τινος ἄρχων,	dact tetram
861	ἀλλά τις ὥς Αἰδαί πάρα κείμενος.	dact tetram
862	δρα, βλέπ' εἰ καίρια φθέγγηι.	ia + dochm
863	τὸ δ' ἁλώσιμον ἑμαῖ φροντίδι, παῖ,	ia + dochm. (?)
864	πόνος ὁ μὴ φοβῶν κράτιστος.	dochm + bacch

The strophe and antistrophe begin with one line of dactyls, which quickly modulate into the iambo-dochmiac metre that prevails for the rest of the stanza. There are rare forms of the dochmiac colon: — — — — in 828–9/844 and the first part of 830/845, and — — — — in the second part of 830/845 (a 'dragged', clausular version of the more common — — — —). It is hard to name the metrical constituents of 833–6/849–52, but molossoi (— — —) are present in each line, and 837/853 consists of three molossoi, a sequence common in iambo-dochmiac contexts. The stanza ends in 838/854 with a highly resolved dochmiac dimeter. In the strophe, the first five lines consist of one long sentence followed by a short address to Paion; in the antistrophe, they consist of one long sentence. By contrast, the final six lines of both stanzas, when the Chorus press Ne. to consider the current opportunity to depart and the consequences of not doing so, include short sentences of three, one, and two lines. The dactylic hexameters of 839–42

conform to the norms of Homeric verse. They lack the unusual stylistic features of the hexameters at *Tr.* 1010–14/1031–40, which are (probably) chanted by Herakles *within* rather than between strophe and antistrophe; they are more like *Tr.* 1018–22, hexameters chanted by the Old Man and Hyllos *between* these two stanzas. The epode combines aeolic, dactylic, and iambic cola. 855–7, are clearly aeolic and may best be understood as a hipponactean colon followed by a telesilleian colon plus an ‘extra’ $\cup - -$, the characteristic *clausula* of the hipponactean. This is preferable to understanding the sequence as two ‘dovetailing’ glyconic cola – in which the final syllable of the first colon also functions as the first syllable of the next – followed by $\cup - -$. 858–61, in which the metrically anomalous 859 is possibly an interpolation (see 855–61n.), echo the opening of the strophe and antistrophe with a run of dactyls that modulates through a heavy final syllable into the iambo-dochmiac metre of the final three lines.

827–32 The strophe begins with a hymn to Sleep, a prayer that alludes to and interacts with the genre of choral lyric known as the *paian*, a ritual song performed (1) to ward off or protect against a natural evil (e.g. a plague) or an evil of human origin (e.g. an invasion); (2) to celebrate an evil averted (e.g. by a victory in battle or the ratification of peace) or a festive occasion (e.g. a wedding). Specific features of rhetoric, diction, and style in 827–32 conform to the conventions of the *paian*: (1) invocation of the god by name (827–9), followed by the wish that he come to accomplish something for the speaker (830–1) and by a second invocation under the name of Paion (832); (2) repetitions of ὕπνῃ, εὐαίης/εὐαίων, and ἴθι, which are like the refrains found in other *paians* (e.g. *Tr.* 221 ἰὼ ἰὼ Παῖαν, *OT* 154 ἰήϊε Δάλιε Παῖαν, Pind. *Paian* 5.1, 19, 37, 43 ἰήϊε Δάλι’ Ἀπολλων) and in Greek liturgy generally (cf. Kranz 1933: 128–9); (3) language denoting ‘brightness’ or ‘shining’, which is ritually associated with healing (cf. 830–1n.); (4) metrical sequences of *molossoi* (– – –); (5) ‘verbal embellishment, including alliteration and ‘euphonious’ . . . long vowels and diphthongs in echoed sequence’ (Burton 1980: 241n.10; cf. Watkins 1995: 515, Kitzinger 2008: 116).

The *paian* is frequently associated with Apollo Paian (Apollo the ‘Healer’), e.g. *OT* 154, Aesch. *Ag.* 146; with Apollo and Artemis, cf. *Tr.* 207–15, 222; with Paian (epic Παῖδῶν) conceived of as a separate deity, e.g. *Il.* 5.401, 899, Hes. fr. 307.2, *Od.* 4.232; or with Apollo’s son, the physician-god Asklepios. Sleep is associated with the worship of Asklepios in Sikyon (Paus. 2.10.8) and with that of Asklepios and Hygieia in Athens (cf. Haldane 1963: 54). Here the Chorus pray for Phil. to be healed by Sleep (cf. Soph. fr. 201h [from *Eriphyle*] ὕπνον ἱατρὸν νόσου, Eur. *Or.* 211–12), but at the same time they hope to steal the bow and depart, while he is sleeping, which would destroy him. At 830–1 they ask Sleep (whom at 832 they seem to identify with Paion), to hold the bright light (αἴγλαν) of restorative sleep before Phil.’s eyes, but at 855–6 they describe Phil. as ‘without eyes’ (ἀνόμματος), i.e. ‘unseeing’, which might suggest the darkness

of death rather than the brightness which is a common feature of the life-saving and restorative *paian* (Swift 2010: 30–1, 71–2). The Chorus' prayer to Sleep for assistance in what amounts to a betrayal of Phil. recalls their earlier exploitation of religion as a means to betray him (cf. 391–402, 507–18); because the *paian*, as a genre, often calls attention to 'the justice of the gods, and their role as arbiters of the moral order' (Swift 2010: 67), the Chorus' prayer at 827–32 invites an audience or reader to consider whether such a betrayal might be morally justified. For the *paian* as a genre, see Käppel 1992, Schröder 1999, Rutherford 2001: 3–108, Furley and Bremer 1.84–91, Ford 2006, Swift 2010: 60–70. For the *paian* in tragedy, see Rutherford 2001: 108–15, Swift 2010: 30–1, 70–103.

827 Ὕπν' . . . ἀλγέων 'Sleep unacquainted with pain, Sleep (unacquainted) with griefs.' Normally μέν and δέ are used when the same word is repeated with emphasis in successive clauses (anaphora), but there are many exceptions (GP 163), and in particular, μέν is omitted in cult hymnal invocations where the name of a divinity is repeated. ἀδᾶης governs gen. ὀδύνας in the first clause, and an understood ἀδᾶης governs ἀλγέων in the second. In the first Ὕπν(ε) the syllable with υ, a short vowel, is 'heavy' before πν (plosive + liquid), but in the second Ὕπνε the syllable with υ is 'light', cf. 294–7n.

828 εὐαῆς . . . (εὐαίων) 'may you come blowing fair' (i.e. 'breathing gently'). The conjecture of an additional εὐαίων between ἐλθοῖς and εὐαίων achieves metrical responsion between 827–9 and 843–4. Similarly, ἀντίσχοις for ἀντέχοις achieves exact responsion between 830 and 845.

830–1 ὀμμασι . . . ταῦν 'may you hold before (his) eyes this bright light (αἴγλαν) that has been spread (before them) now' (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀντέχω 1). Bright or shining light is a standard feature of the *paian*, in which ἀγλαός and its cognates, including αἴγλη (-α), occur frequently (Swift 2010: 68 n. 24). This is in keeping with the general significance of light as a symbol of life and health; cf. 415 with n., 624–5 with n., 663–4 with n. Αἴγλη is the mother of Asklepios in Isyllos, *Paeon* 4th (Powell 134), but more often, as in 831, his daughter (cf. Haldane 1963: 55, Webster on 830 ff., Swift 2010: 69 with n. 27). The language of vision, corresponding to the language of light, is particularly frequent throughout the *kommos* (cf. 833, 843, 847–8, 851, 854), which makes the *paian* cohere with the rest of the lyric, even though it is a distinct unit, and despite the tension between sleep as a beneficent cure for Phil. and the Chorus' sense that the αἴγλα will make it possible to steal the bow, without which he cannot survive (cf. 827–32n., Kitzinger 2008: 116). τέταται is perf. mid-pass. of τέλω, a normal word for the 'spreading' of light or darkness; cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 599–600 ἐσχάτας ὅπερ | ῥίζας τέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίπῳ δόμοις.

832 τοῖ τοῖ for the hiatus, cf. *Ant.* 1328 ἴτω ἴτω. μοι is ethical dat.

833–5 ὦ τέκνον . . . φροντίδος lit. 'Child, look where you will stand, and where you direct your steps, and how (there should be) a care for me (i.e. 'what I should be concerned with') in respect to things from this point on'. Cf. *Aj.* 1237

ποι βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος, Eur. *Alc.* 863 ποῖ βῶ, ποῖ στῶ, *Hec.* 1056–7 πᾶι βῶ, πᾶι στῶ. φροντίδος is *partit. gen.* after πῶς, with ἔσῃ understood. The Chorus want Ne. to realize what he is doing and also want to know how they themselves should be thinking in order to help him, as they have tried to do previously; cf. 142–3, 148–9.

836 πρὸς . . . πράσσειν ‘toward what (end) are we waiting (so as) to act?’ πρᾶσσειν is *epexegetic inf.*, with ὥστε understood. μένομεν: the emendation is necessary to bring about metrical *responson* with 852, a line consisting of *cretic* + *molossos*, which fits well in the metrical context of *syncopated iambics* (cf. Dawe 1973–8: III.131). In addition, the present tense (‘toward what end [i.e. ‘why’] are we waiting [so as] to act?’) is more natural and direct than the future (‘toward what end will we be waiting [so as] to act?’).

837–8 καιρὸς τοι . . . ἄρνυται ‘the critical moment, decisive in all things, promptly wins many, many a dominant victory!’ Cf. *El.* 75–6. καιρὸς γάρ, ὅσπερ ἀνδράσιν | μέγιστος ἔργου παντός ἐστ’ ἐπιστάτης, Pind. *Pyth.* 9.78–9 ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως | παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν. On the meaning and associations of καιρὸς, see 466–7n. For παρὰ πόδα ‘promptly’, ‘suddenly’, cf. Plat. *Soph.* 242a10 παρὰ πόδα μεταβαλὼν ἑμαυτὸν ἄνω καὶ κάτω. Hermann’s (πολύ τι) at the beginning of 838 restores *responson* with 854.

839–42 *Dactylic hexameter* is the characteristic metre of both heroic epic and oracular responses (Bowra 1944: 281). Ne. is thinking of Helenos’ prophecy, as well as Phil.’s and his own role in the heroic sack of Troy. These lines have been called Ne.’s ‘first moment of conscious moral action’ (Whitman 1951: 176), but they need not express anything moral, only a pragmatic concern for whether, in light of Helenos’ prophecy, Phil. is needed as well as the bow. When Ne. calls attention to Phil.’s helplessness (ἀλλ’ ὅδε μὲν κλύει οὐδέν) and goes on to say that he realizes they have captured the bow in vain, if they leave without Phil., he does not seem particularly ‘moral’, though perhaps he is represented as having mixed feelings. θήραν . . . πλέοντες ‘we have this prey of the bow in vain, if we

sail without this man’. Ne. speaks like Od., cf. 116n., 608–9n. τόξων is *gen.* of definition with θήρα (‘prey consisting of the bow’, cf. 609), not the *obj.* of the verbal force in θήραν (‘hunting of the bow’). τήνδε suggests a gesture by Ne. with or toward the bow, τοῦδε a gesture toward Phil. τοῦδε . . . τοῦτον:

for the combination of pronouns, cf. 1331, 1434–5, 1437. τοῦδε γάρ ὁ στέφανος suggests both ‘for the crown of victory (in the war) is this man’s’ (*possessive gen.*) and ‘the crown of victory (for us) (consists) of this man’ (*gen.* of definition, cf. *Aj.* 465 στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν, Paley *ad loc.*, Winnington-Ingram 1969: 49). Whether it is a matter of taking Troy or taking Philoktetes, both constructions emphasize the necessity of not leaving him on the island, as the Chorus have suggested.

κομπεῖν . . . σὺν ψεύδεσιν ‘it’s a shameful reproach to boast of things unaccomplished with falsehoods’. σὺν ψεύδεσιν goes closely with ἀτελῇ but is also felt with κομπεῖν. Ne. implies that such boasting would not be a

'shameful reproach', if 'things' were successfully 'accomplished with falsehoods'. Cf. Reinhardt 1979: 181, Alt 1961: 158-9.

843-64 The tone of the antistrophe and epode is increasingly urgent, as the Chorus press Ne. to take the bow and depart and to be aware of the consequences of his decision that Phil. too, as well as the bow, must come to Troy.

843 *ὄψεταί* 'will see to', 'will provide for', cf. *Αἴ.* 1165 *κάπετόν τιν' ἰδεῖν*. Despite Ne.'s words in 839-42, the Chorus' approach to the opportunity presented by Phil.'s collapse is that a god will see to the fulfilment of the prophecy about him, but *we* should seize the present opportunity.

844-5 *ὦν . . . φήμαν* 'whatever (words) you give in response again, send me, child, a low, low sound of words', i.e. 'whisper'. *ἀμείβομαι* takes a double acc. (cf. *OC* 991 *ἐν γάρ μ' ἀμειψαί*), but *οὖς* becomes *ὦν* by attraction to *λόγων*. *βαίαν μοι | βαίαν ὦ* at the same metrical position in the antistrophe as *εὐαίων | εὐαίων* in the strophe suggests a special effect of music and/or dance in both stanzas. Cf. 837 *γνώμαν ἰσχων* in the strophe corresponding with 853 *γνώμαν ἰσχεις* in the antistrophe; 206-7 *στίβου κατ' ἀνάγ- | καν ἔρποντος* ~ 215-16 *πταίω νυπ' ἀνάγ- | κας* with 215-16n.

846 *ὥς* is virtually the equivalent of *γάρ*, giving the reason for what has just been said. Cf. 884, 914.

846-7 *ὥς . . . λεύσσειν* 'as the sleep that is non-sleep of all men with disease is quick to see', i.e. all sick men sleep so lightly that they are not really asleep and are ready to see. *λεύσσειν* is exegetical inf., clarifying *εὐδρακής*. As Jebb notes, the language of vision is here used of perception generally: the Chorus have just told Ne. to keep his *voice* down.

849-51 *ἀλλ' . . . πράξεις* 'but look as far as you can (i.e. 'use your utmost care') (to see) how you will do that thing for me, that thing for me, secretly'. *ὅτι δύναι μάκιστον* modifies *ἔξιδοῦ*, which has as its obj. *ὅπως πράξεις*. Repeated *κεῖνο* (i.e. taking the bow and leaving), is emphatic and opposed to 843 *τάδε*, which refers to Ne.'s comment in 839-42 that they must bring 'this man' (841 *τοῦτον*) to Troy with them. *ὅτι δύναι μάκιστον* could also be understood as an anticipatory relative clause, which is picked up by *κεῖνο . . . κεῖνο . . .*: 'the farthest-reaching thing you have in your power, see how you will do that thing for me' (cf. Kamerbeek 125). The text printed here includes several conjectures in 850, which bring about metrical responson with 834 without changing the basic sense. It also would be possible to achieve such responson by altering the text of 850 less radically, e.g. *κεῖνό <δὴ> μοι, κεῖνο λάθραι*, as well as that of 834: e.g. *ποῖ δέ μοι τάνθενδε βάσῃ* (Jebb). This change in 834, however, would eliminate both the rhetorical crescendo of *ποῦ στάσῃ, / ποῖ δέ βάσῃ, πῶς δέ μοι τάντεῦθεν | φροντίδος* and the Chorus' concern not only with Ne.'s actions but with their own attitude from this point on (cf. 833-5n.)

852 *ὄν*: referring to Phil.

853-4 *εἰ . . . πάθῃ* 'if you hold this thought concerning this man, the sufferings to see (in this) are indeed insoluble, for those who are shrewd' (i.e. 'for anyone

with any sense'). **τούτῳ** is dat. of relation used to indicate a person (Phil.) to whom or about whom the statement of the predicate (here, **ταῦταν . . . γνῶμαν**) is limited (cf. Smyth §1495, cf. K–G 1.416); it is almost equivalent to **περὶ τούτου**. Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 598d2 **ὑπολαμβάνειν δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ** **ὅτι εὐθής ἐστιν** 'we must respond concerning such a man that he is a simple-minded person'. **ταῦταν . . . γνῶμαν** refers to Ne.'s decision (in 839–42) that not only the bow but Phil. himself must come to Troy. The 'insoluble sufferings' mentioned in 854 will turn out to be those arising from the conflict between Ne. and Od. over what to do with Phil., not those of Phil. himself. **πυκινούς ἐνιδεῖν**: **πυκ(ι)νός** is normally used of thoughts or the mind that produces them rather than of persons, but cf. Critias, *Sisyphos* fr. 19.12 **πυκνός τις καὶ σοφὸς γνῶμην ἀνὴρ**, Pind. *Ol.* 13.52–3 **Σίσυφον . . . πυκνότατον παλάμαις**. For **ἐνιδεῖν** used of seeing a difficulty or risk in a specific course of action, cf. Hdt. 1.89.1 **εἶρετο Κροῖσον ὅτι ὁ ἐνορώη ἐν τοῖσι ποιευμένοισι** 'he asked Kroisos what he saw for himself in the things that were happening'.

855 οὔρος . . . οὔρος 'there is a favourable wind for you, son, a favourable wind'. Σ nicely glosses **οὔρος** by **καιρὸς ἐπιτήδειος**. The word is used figuratively; it does not mean that the direction of the wind has shifted from what it was at 640. Cf. *Tr.* 815–16 **οὔρος ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν | αὐτῇ γένοιτ' ἄπῳθεν ἐρπούση καλὸς** with Easterling's note.

855–61 ἀνὴρ . . . κείμενος lit. 'the man, without use of his eyes, nor having any assistance, has been stretched out in the darkness of night (a good (i.e. "sound") sleep is without fear), in command not of his hand, not of his foot, not of anything, but like someone lying with Hades'. **νύχιος** is pred. adj. modifying **ἀνὴρ**, while **ἀδεής . . . ἐσθλός** is a parenthetical comment on **ἐκτέταται νύχιος**. Most editors prefer **ἀλεής**, the reading of the MSS, to **ἀδεής**. **ἀλεής**, which would occur only here in surviving Greek literature, would presumably be cognate with **ἀλέα** 'warmth', 'heat', so the sense of the parenthesis in 859 would be, 'sleep in the heat (of the sun) is sound'. Perhaps this line is an interpolation, a marginal note of some kind (e.g. citing a parallel) that found its way into the text; the metre is intrusive and difficult to account for in its dactylic context. **οὐδ' . . . ἀρωγάν**: Phil.

now lacks his bow and has no one to help him. **οὐ τινος ἀρχων**: cf. 1161 **μηκέτι μηδενὸς κρατύνων**. **ἄιδαι . . . κείμενος**: cf. *OT* 972 **κείται παρ' Αἰδη**. For the accent on **πάρα**, cf. 6n.

863–4 τὸ . . . κράτιστος lit. 'in regard to what can be grasped by my mind (i.e. 'as far as my mind can grasp (the matter)'), child, the labour not causing fear is best'. This mental sense of **ἀλώσιμον** is unparalleled (cf. LSJ *s.v.*); usually the word refers to a person or place that can be (easily) captured or conquered or to something, e.g. a song or a report, associated with conquest. **πόνος** is a self-serving euphemism on the part of the Chorus for stealing the bow and leaving, and their use of the word is perhaps ill considered, since the bow once belonged to Her., the supreme achiever of **πόνοι**. It is, however, no accident that Her. is alluded to at the end of the first episode (670), at the end of the stasimon (727–9),

in the scene of Phil.'s paroxysm (801–3), and (less directly) here, at the end of the *kommos*. These allusions prepare the way for his eventual appearance *ex machina* at 1409.

865–1080: THIRD EPISODE

Phil. awakens, grateful for the friendship and care of Ne. and the Chorus, but soon guesses from Ne.'s confused hesitation that he plans to betray him. When he hears explicitly that he 'must' go to Troy, Phil., in the first of his two long speeches in this scene (927–62), by turns berates, supplicates, and cajoles Ne., demanding the return of his bow. Ne., affected by pity and uncertain of how to proceed, seems on the point of returning it, when Od. intervenes suddenly at 974. Od. insists that Phil. must come to Troy and that, in compelling him to do so, he himself is acting as Zeus's servant (989–90). He commands his men to restrain Phil. physically (1003), so that he cannot frustrate them by jumping to his death from the high cliff; Phil. responds with his second long speech (1004–44), bitterly attacking Od. and the sons of Atreus and calling on the gods to destroy them. Od. brushes Phil. off with a brief, sophistic justification of his actions (1047–53). He cruelly tells Phil. to 'enjoy strolling on Lemnos' (1060) and that he is not needed because Od. himself will use the bow at Troy and gain the honour that should have been his (1061–2). Od. and Ne. depart for the ship, leaving behind the Chorus, at Phil.'s request, to keep him company, and in the hope, on Ne.'s part, that Phil. will change his mind for the better (1078–9).

865–6 σιγᾶν . . . κάρα: as Phil. begins to awaken, Ne. warns his men to keep their wits about them, i.e. not to say anything that will give away their plan. This calculated guardedness makes Phil.'s spontaneous exclamation of gratitude (867–8) all the more moving. **μηδ' . . . φρενῶν:** cf. Eur. *Or.* 1021 ἐξέστην φρενῶν, Ar. *Vesp.* 1457–8 τὸ γὰρ ἀποστῆναι χαλεπὸν | φύσεως. **κινεῖ . . . κάρα:** Phil. is opening his eyes to look around and 'raising his head', which had fallen backward (822).

867–8 ὦ . . . ξένων lit. 'o light that is successor to sleep, and the staying and watching of these friends, unbelievable (even) in my hopes (i.e. "which (even) my hopes could not have believed possible")'. For the joyous apostrophes, first to (day)light, then to Ne. and the Chorus, cf. 530–1. Any doubts Phil. may have had about their loyalty (cf. 809–13) have vanished. Soph. often uses -μα nouns in direct personal apostrophes and descriptions to convey strong emotion, e.g. 234–5; cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 235–8 ὦ φίλτατον μέλημα . . . ὦ τερπνὸν ὄμμα. See Long 1968: 118–20, 123–4. **οἰκούρημα . . . ξένων** is an emphatic periphrasis for οἱ ξένοι οἰκουροῦντες (Long 1968: 99n.127). οἰκούρημα means literally 'guarding (or 'watching') a house'; cf. 1328 οἰκουρῶν ὄφεις (with 1326–8n.) and Ar. *Vesp.* 970 οἰκουρός (of a watchdog). It also can be used figuratively, e.g. Eur. *Or.* 928 τᾶνδον

οἰκουρήματα referring to the women who stay at home while men go to war. **ἀπίδων ἀπιστονι** for the gen. of agent after negative or negated verbal adjectives that are passive in meaning, cf. 1066-7 οὐδέ . . . φωνῆς . . . προσφθεγκτός, *Ant.* 8.17 φίλων ἀκλαυτος 'unwept by loved ones', *El.* 1214 ἀτιμος . . . τοῦ τεθνηκότος 'unhonoured by the dead'. Passive participles can take a similar gen., e.g. *Tr.* 934 ἐκδιδοχθεῖς τῶν κατ' οἶκον. See Moorhouse 68-9, 75, Smyth §1390.

869-71 οὐ . . . μέναι: the word-order suggests that *ἐν* goes with ἐξηύχης in a past potential construction ('I would never have claimed this') (Smyth §1784, *GMF* §§244), not (as might seem easier) with τλήναι (= ὅτι τλαίης *ἐν*), which is a complementary inf. dependent on ἐξηύχης. The aor. τλήναι without *ἐν* rather than the fut. τλήσεσθαι can be used, because of the sense of futurity often implied by ἐξουχέω. Cf. Aesch. *PV* 688-9 οὐποθ' <ὥδ'> οὐποτ' ηὔχουν ξένους | μολεῖσθαι λόγους ἐς ἀκοάν ἑμάν, Eur. *Hel.* 1619-20 οὐκ *ἐν* ποτ' ηὔχουν οὔτε σ' οὐθ' ἡμᾶς λαθεῖν | Μενέλαον. See Jebb, Appendix: 246-7. παρόντα καὶ ξυνωφελοῦντά μοι is hendiadys: 'assisting me by being present'.

872-3 οὐκουν . . . ἐνεγκεῖν 'the Atreidai, at any rate, did not bring themselves (i.e. 'have the courage') easily to bear this (burden)'. The effect of -ουν in οὐκουν is to present, as it were, the Atreidai for consideration and to justify Phil.'s irony at their expense and his admiration for Ne.'s loyalty. Despite the word order, τοῦτ' is obj. of ἐνεγκεῖν, not of ἔτλησαν. Blaydes 1899: 236, followed by Denniston 1929: 118, *GP* 424, proposed γ' αὐτ' for τοῦτ', since in Attic γε is almost always found after emphatic οὐκουν (cf. 907, 1389), but τοῦτ' is far more vivid and pointed. εὐφόρως . . . ἐνεγκεῖν 'to bear easily' has a medical resonance: cf. Hipp. *Aph.* 1.13 εὐφορώτατα φέρειν, *Fract.* 18 πολὺ μὲν εὐφορώτερον φέρουσι. Cf. *OT* 783-4 δυσφόρως | τοῦνιδος ἦγον. With οὕτως understand ὡς σύ.

873 ἀγαθοί is crasis of οἱ ἀγαθοί. The article expresses sarcasm and scorn, cf. *Ant.* 31 τὸν ἀγαθὸν Κρέοντα, 275 τοῦτο τάγαθόν. Cf. *OT* 385 Κρέων ὁ πιστός with Dawe's note.

874-6 ἀλλ' . . . γέμων: cf. 9-11, 473-4, 519-20, 1031-2. For γέμων with a gen. indicating an intangible sensation, cf. *OT* 4-5 πόλις δ' ὁμοῦ μὲν θυμιαμάτων γέμει, | ὁμοῦ δὲ παιάνων τε καὶ στεναγμάτων. There is an implicit contrast between ἐν εὐχερεί and 473 δυσχέρεια. For ἀλλά . . . γάρ, see 81-2n.; for τίθεσθαι *ἐν* . . . referring to 'mental action', see 451, 473, *LSJ* s.v. τίθημι v.ii.3; cf. 498-9 ἐν . . . σμικρῶι . . . | ποιοῦμενοι. Attributive ἡ σὴ is made more emphatic by its distance from ἡ φύσις at 874. εὐγενής . . . κάθ' εὐγενῶν: cf. 384 with 383-4n., *OT* 1397 κακός τ' ὦν κάκ κακῶν, *El.* 589 εὐσεβεῖς κάθ' εὐσεβῶν, Ar. *Ran.* 731 καὶ

πονηροῖς κάκ πονηρῶν. See too 88-9, 719, 1310-12.

877-8 καὶ νῦν . . . δῆ: 'and now, when there seems to be a certain forgiveness of the evil, even (καὶ . . . δῆ) a respite'. καὶ νῦν, further defined by ἔπειθε . . . εἶναι, is in contrast to the past time of 876 ἴθου and looks forward to 879 ἄρον . . . κατάστησον. *Doxai* agrees in number with the closest of its two

subjects, λήθη. For τοῦδε τοῦ κακοῦ . . . λήθη, cf. Eur. *Or.* 213 ὦ πότνια λήθη τῶν κακῶν. For καὶ . . . δὴ ‘even’, ‘actually’, cf. Pl. *Meno* 96d2 ὥστε καὶ . . . θαυμάζω δὴ, *GP* 254.

878–9 τέκνον . . . τέκνον: Phil. is still lying on the ground; the repetition of τέκνον at the end of successive lines (cf. 875 ὦ τέκνον) frames his request that Ne. help him rise. Like the highly rhetorical repetition of σύ and μ(ε) in 879, τέκνον . . . τέκνον reiterates Phil.’s sense of the intimate relationship he shares with Ne. αὐτός makes it clear that he wants only Ne., not the Chorus, to assist him, so Ne.’s suggestion (886–7) that Phil. should lift himself up or have the Chorus lift him seems particularly insensitive.

880 κόπος can mean both ‘suffering’ and ‘fatigue’, but the latter sense is prevalent here, after Phil.’s paroxysm. Cf. Eur. *Ba.* 634 κόπου ὕπο, *Pho.* 852 κόπωι παρῆμαι. Perhaps the word has a specifically medical association: cf. Hipp. *IM* 21 ‘One must know what will be the effect of a bath taken unseasonably or what (the effect) of fatigue (κόπος).’ κόπος is made more emphatic here by its placement before μ’ at pos. 6, bisecting the trimeter.

881 ὀρώμεθα: the action returns to the point of impending departure (645–75) before the stasimon and Phil.’s subsequent seizure, where in turn talk of departure recalls the situation at 526–39, just before the arrival of the FM. Cf. Seale 1982: 34–5, 46–7. This time, the departure of Phil. and Ne. will be interrupted by Ne.’s crisis of conscience and revelation of the true situation. **μηδ’ ἐπίσχωμεν τὸ πλεῖν:** cf. Thuc. 7.33.3 ἐπέσχον τὸ εὐθέως τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιχειρεῖν ‘they put off attacking the Athenians immediately’. For the artic. inf. in the acc. and τὸ rather than the more usual τὸ μή (οὐ) after the negative verb of ‘negative meaning’, see 118n.

882–8 ἀλλ’ . . . ὄρν: Ne. expresses his satisfaction at seeing that Phil. is still alive and offers him the choice of lifting himself or being helped by some of Ne.’s men. **ἀλλ’ . . . ἔτι:** ἀλλ’ expresses both ‘a sympathetic reaction to [Phil.’s] words’ (*GP* 19) and a readiness to move on. μέν stands alone, without a corresponding δέ, and gives a slight emphasis to ἵδομαι. νῦν δ’ (886) is transitional, not antithetical. ἀνώδυνον, like βλέποντα κάμπνέοντ’, agrees with σ’ but has adverbial force in relation to these two participles. For βλέποντα ‘living’, cf. 624–5 with n., 663, Aesch. *Ag.* 677 ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα. **ὥς . . . ἐφαίνετο** ‘for your outward signs appeared as (those) of one no longer living, in view of your present sufferings’, i.e. ‘your symptoms (when you had collapsed), given your sufferings, seemed like those of one who is dead’. The semantic structure of 884, with a word-group ending at position 6, is in tension with its metrical structure, with a normal caesura at position 5. τὰς παρούσας συμφορὰς refers vividly not to Phil.’s sleep, when he seemed to have died (cf. 861 Ἀἶδα πάρα κείμενος), but more generally to his sufferings on the island, including his paroxysm. This is the only instance in an Attic author of συμβόλαια ‘outward signs’, ‘symptoms’ = σύμβολα, but cf. Hdt. 5.92.η 3 πιστὸν γάρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον. γάρ is the fourth word in its clause, because ὥς οὐκέτ’

δυντος cohere closely enough to form a single unit. Cf. 887 τοῦ πόνου γάρ. νῦν . . . οἶδε: cf. 878–9n.

889–92 αἰνῶ . . . ἔμοι: Phil. courteously acknowledges but declines Ne.'s offer to have his men carry him; then Phil. again asks Ne. to raise him up 'as you have in mind (to do)' (cf. 761), and thus to spare the sailors the πόνος (cf. 888) of direct exposure to the foul smell of his festering wound, until they are all on the ship. For Phil.'s δσμή, cf. 876, 1032 with n. αἰνῶ: αἰνῶ and ἐπαινῶ are common, polite forms of declining an offer or invitation, of saying, 'No, thank you . . .'. Cf. Ar. *Ra.* 508 κάλλιστ', ἐπαινῶ (Xanthias declines the Slave's invitation to enter the house of Persephone), Xen. *Symp.* 1.7 ἐπαινούντες τήν κλῆσιν οὐχ ὑπισχνούντο συνδειπνήσειν. (ἐπ)αινῶ can also imply acceptance or 'thank you', e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 1093 αἰνῶ μὲν αἰνῶ, *Her.* 1235 ἐπήνισ' . . . οὐκ ἀναινομαι. These expressions of polite refusal or thanks are probably colloquial, cf. Quincey 1966: 156, Collard 2005: 371. ὥσπερ νοαῖς: Phil. uses the pres. tense for the implied intention in Ne.'s offer. οὐπὶ . . . ἔμοι: 'for the on-board labour (will be) enough for these men, to live with me'. οὐπὶ is crisis of ὁ ἐπὶ. ὅλις is an adv. used adjectivally with understood ἔσται. συνναλαιν is expegetical inf., explaining πόνος.

893 ἴσται τάδ': this is the only occurrence in Soph. of this phrase, which is a common way of expressing agreement in Eur., e.g. *Alc.* 328, *Med.* 731, *Her.* 898, *El.* 650. ἀλλ' . . . ἀντέχου 'but stand up and (as I support you) you too hold onto (me) in return'. ἀλλ' is hortatory, cf. 230n. For ἴστω = ἀνίστω, cf. *OT* 143 ἴστωσθε, 147 ἰστώμεσθα, cf. 48n. With ἀντέχου understand μου or perhaps ἐμοῦ. The construction is different from that of 830 ἀντίσχοις (with dat.) or 175–6 ἀντέχει (intrans.).

894–7 These lines, which mark clearly the key moment of reversal in the dramatic action and give rise to an emotional stichomythia that continues (with occasional distichomythia) through 925, can be played in three different ways: (1) as Ne. helps Phil. to his feet or Phil. stands on his own and leans on Ne. for support, the two make actual physical contact, unlike at 761–2 and 814–18, and the touch of Phil.'s body catalyzes Ne.'s crisis of conscience. Then he and Phil. trade places verbally: Phil. 'encourages' Ne. with θάρσει (894, cf. 810), and Ne.'s παρσῶ (895) indicates that he is suffering an 'attack' of his own corrosive illness. When Phil. asks ποῖ ποτ' ἐξέβης λόγῳ (896, cf. 814 ποῖ λέγεις), Ne. confesses his helplessness, his inability to know δπηι χρή τάπορον τρέπειν ἔπος 'which way to turn [my] words which have no way (out)'. Cf. Taplin 1971: 27, who sees this contact between the two men 'mirrored' in 1403, when Ne. invites Phil. to lean on him as they prepare to depart, and Phil. accepts this offer; Kaimio 1988: 24; Pucci 260. (2) Phil. stands on his own and does not actually make physical contact with Ne., in accordance with his continuing desire not to be touched. For Webster 125, followed by Ussher 77 (cf. stage direction between 893 and 894), such contact is excluded by 894. (3) Phil. stands on his own but leans lightly on Ne. for support. Cf. Kosak 1999: 129, who notes the urgency of other male sufferers

in Attic tragedy to stand on their own, e.g. Eur. *Or.* 228, 795, *Her.* 1395. The first of these three ways of playing the scene would be far more effective theatrically than the second or third, but whatever the staging, it is clear that Ne., who earlier had found language with which to deceive Phil., now has none with which to tell him the truth. For a similar reversal, cf. 906, 913 τοῦτ' ἀνιώμαι πάλαι, where Ne. describes his own emotional state by using a verb previously used at 283 by Phil. to describe the pain caused by his disease and isolation on Lemnos. In 896 and again in 898, Phil. calls Ne. παῖ and τέκνον, as if the reassertion of their 'father-child' relationship could ward off whatever bad thing is happening. σύνθηες . . . ἔθος 'my customary habit will set me upright'. For the cognate noun and adj., cf. *Ant.* 502 κλέος . . . εὐκλέεστερον. τί . . . γε: 'what could I do next (*sc.* to help)'? For Ne.'s question, cf. 757n. Schaefer's restoration of ἄν is not strictly necessary, since the opt. can be used without ἄν in rhetorical questions (e.g. *Ant.* 604–5 τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἄν- | δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; Aesch. *Cho.* 594 5 ὑπέρτολμον ἄν- | δρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι) and indefinite sentences beginning οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις, ὅπως, etc. Cf. Smyth §§1821, 2662c., *GMT* §242, Moorhouse 229–30, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 591–3. Nevertheless, (ἄν) is convincing in light of 1393 τί δῆτ' ἄν ἡμεῖς δρῶμεν. Without ἄν, the question would be, in effect, a wish 'that there were some way in which I could be helpful.' With ἄν, the element of wish is present but the optative is potential, and the emphasis is on how what is wished for could be fulfilled: 'I wish I could act so as to do something (helpful).' Cf. πῶς ἄν with the opt. in questions expressing a wish at 531–2, 794–5; see Smyth §1832, *SCG* 1.178–9, *GMT* §236. For adverbial τοῦνθένδε γε, cf. 834 τάντεῦθεν. γε at the end of the line is more than usually emphatic, cf. 438. ἐξέβης λόγῳ: Phil.'s metaphor (of going out of bounds) is picked up in the next line by Ne.'s δπηι . . . τρέπειν. Cf. Dem. 18.211 ἐπανελεῖν οὖν, ὁπόθεν ἐνταῦθ' ἐξέβην, βούλομαι.

898 ἀπορεῖς . . . τάδε: 'what are *you* helpless about'? O child, don't be saying this'. τοῦ = τίνος.

899 ἀλλ' . . . κυρῶ 'but now I happen (to be helpless) (at this point) here in this suffering'. τοῦδε . . . πάθους is partit. gen., dependent on ἐνθάδε. τοῦδε picks up Phil.'s τάδε in the previous line, cf. 897–8, ἀπορον . . . ἀπορεῖς, 917–18 μάθης . . . μάθημα, 100–22n.

900–1 οὐ . . . ἔτι: Soph. uses οὐ δῆ, usually followed by πού or ποτε, eight times in the surviving plays to 'introduce a surprised or incredulous question' (cf. *Ant.* 381, *Tr.* 668, 876, *OT* 1472, *El.* 1108, 1180, 1202); the idiom is not found in other writers (*GP* 223). Here the question reflects Phil.'s deepest fear. ἔπαισεν: ἔπαισεν is the reading of most MSS, but the more forceful minority reading ἔπαισεν seems preferable, especially with δυσχέρεια 'disgust', also a strong word, as its subj. (Fraenkel 1977 : 64). ἔπαισεν is more likely to have been changed at some point to the more common and easier-to-understand ἐπείσεν than the reverse. For ναύτην = ναυβάτην, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 719 πεζὸς ἢ ναύτης.

902 ἅπαντα δυσχέρεια 'all things are disgust'. For a neut. pl. as subj. with a sing. noun as pred., cf. *OC* 883 ἄρ' οὐχ ὕβρις τάδ'.

902-3 τὴν... προσεικόται: cf. 79-80, 88-9, 874, 1310-11.

904-5 ἄλλ'... φωνεῖς 'but you, at least, are doing or saying nothing not in keeping with the one who sired you'. ἔξω 'not in keeping with', 'departing from the standard of', can be used as a preposition with abstract nouns, cf. Thucyd. 2.65.7 ἔξω τοῦ πολέμου, Isoc. 12. 74 ἔξω τοῦ ὑποθέσεως.

906 αἰσχροῦς φανοῦμαι 'I will appear in ugly fashion', i.e. 'disgraced', 'base'. Either Ne. is so engrossed in his own thoughts that he does not hear Phil.'s comment in 904-5, or he hears him and in response expresses his own sense of failure to live up to his father's (and Phil.'s) standard, using language characteristic of the 'shame culture' depicted in Homeric epic. Cf. 842 αἰσχροῦν ὄνειδος. τοῦτ'... πάλαι: cf. 806n., 894-7n., 913, 966.

907 οὐκουν... ὀκνῶ 'not, at any rate, in what you *do*, but in what you speak, I am afraid' (sc. 'lest you appear in ugly fashion', with understood μή αἰσχροῦς φανῇ). Phil. sees no cause for shame in Ne.'s present actions, but hesitates at what his words may portend. The contrast between ἐν οἷς γε δρᾷς and ἐν οἷς δ' οὐδᾷς is heightened both by the verbal repetition and by the placement of δρᾷς at position 6, rhetorically bisecting the line, despite the normal caesura at position 5; cf. 880, 989, 1009, *Ant.* 555 σὺ μὲν γὰρ εἶλου ζῆν, ἐγὼ δὲ κατθανεῖν. For οὐκουν... γε, cf. 872n.

908-9 ὦ Ζεῦ... ἐπὶ ὧν 'O Zeus, what should I do? Should I be caught (being) base a second time, both hiding what must not (be hidden) and saying the most shameful of words? For Ne.'s anguished appeal to Zeus, cf. 1233, *OT* 738 ὦ Ζεῦ, τί μου δρᾶσαι βεβούλευσαι πέρι; δρᾶσω is delib. aor. subjunct., cf. 757n. ληφθῶ also is delib. subjunct., though it is not introduced by an interrog. word. (Cf. Smyth §1805, *GMT* §287, Moorhouse 223-5). τί δρᾶσω (cf. 757n.) often implies that the character asking this question is unable to remain faithful to, or continue in, a course of action already undertaken. Cf. 974 with 974-5n., Aesch. *Cho.* 899, Pucci 264-5. **δεύτερον:** Ne. alludes to his first outright lie to Phil., when he said that he was sailing home from Troy, after having been robbed of his father's arms (240, 360-84); 'a second time' refers to his fear that he will soon be caught hiding the truth that Phil. must go to Troy with Od. and himself. Actually, though, Ne. was κακός when he first agreed to help Od. by lying to Phil., even though he was not 'caught' in that particular act of κακία. δεύτερον... κακός may suggest 'doubly base', in addition to 'base a second time'. **ἃ μὴ δεῖ:** cf. 903 τὰ μὴ προσεικότα.

910-11 ἀνὴρ... στελεῖν 'this man, if I am not by nature bad in judgement, seems likely to sail away, having betrayed and abandoned me'. With the change to the third person Phil. distances himself from Ne., whom he pointedly does not call 'child'. Phil. speaks in bitter exasperation, to be heard by Ne. as well as the Chorus, not in an aside. Cf. Her.'s switch to the third person at *Tr.* 1238, with

Easterling's n.

τὸν πλοῦν στελεῖν: cf. *Aj.* 1045 τόνδε πλοῦν ἐστείλαμεν. At 571, 640 στέλλω has the same meaning without πλοῦν.

912 λιπών: for the simple verb echoing a compound form in the previous line, cf. 1383 αἰσχύνοιτ' after 1382 καταισχύνη.

912-13 λυπηρῶς... πάλαι lit. 'but rather lest I convey you painfully, at this I am long since pained'. Ne. begins as if using a μή clause dependent on an unexpressed verb of fearing; then, using the same words as in 906, he changes the construction, summing up what he has just said with an emphatic τοῦτ', acc. of respect with ἀνιῶμαι. (Cf. 806n., 894-7n., 966.) Such repetition in close proximity is rare, but cf. 87/8 πράσσειν; 878-9 τέκνον; 1267/8/9/71 λόγους/λόγων/λόγοις/λόγοισιν with 1267-9n.; 1299/1300/1301 βέλος/μεθῆς. For other examples in Soph.'s seven plays, see Easterling 1973: 20-34. πέμπω: for πέμπω 'convey', 'escort', cf. 1368, 1399, 1465.

914 τί ποτε... μανθάνω: Phil., despite his worst fears, is uncomprehending. The resolution at position 2 of the line reflects his agitated confusion (cf. 918), and ὦ τέκνον, his effort to cling to the relationship with Ne.

915-16 οὐδέν σε... στόλον: Ne. finally comes out with the truth, or at least some of it: despite saying that he 'will hide nothing', he does not tell Phil. that he is acting for Od., who is himself present on Lemnos. The details are presented in ascending order of how greatly they will trouble Phil., as if Ne. is leaving the worst news for last: Phil. must go to Troy, to the Achaeans, to the army of the Atreidai. For γάρ, cf. 1049-53n. For the double acc. with κρύψω, cf. *El.* 957 οὐδέν γάρ σε δεῖ κρύπτειν μ' ἔτι, *Od.* 4.350 τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.

917 τί εἶπας: for the hiatus, cf. 100n. For πρὶν μάθης without ἄν, cf. 764 ἔως ἀνῆι with 763-6n.

918 νοεῖς: cf. 921 (a more sinister use of the word than at 889).

919-20 σῶσαι... μολών 'to save (you) from, first, this plague here, and then with you to go and sack the plain of Troy'. τοῦδ' is emphatic, owing to the strong sense-break at pos. 8 and to the placement of μέν after κακοῦ, disrupting the parallelism between σῶσαι and πορθῆσαι. σῶσαι is complementary inf. dependent on νοῶ understood from νοεῖς in the previous line. At 109, Od. spoke of the theft of Phil.'s bow as bringing 'salvation' (τὸ σωθῆναι), and at 501 Phil. himself urged Ne. to 'pity' and 'save' him (σύ σῶσον, σύ μ' ἐλέησον), but this is Ne.'s first explicit use of the word. With ξύν σοι, Ne. tries to emphasize that he and Phil. will be acting together (cf. 1335 and, in a different key, 1423, 1434-7). For πεδία πορθῆσαι, cf. 69 πέρσαι... πέδον, 1297, 1332.

921 καὶ... νοεῖς 'and this you truly intend'? καὶ frequently introduces and reinforces a question conveying surprise, indignation, or sarcasm; in so doing it can have either copulative or adverbial force or, as here, both. Cf. *GP* 311-12.

921-2 πολλὰ... ἀνάγκη 'a great necessity controls these things', a strategically impersonal statement, beginning with *antiblatē* after sentence end at pos.

8 in one line and ending, after enjambment, with a strong sense-break at the caesura of the next line.

923–4 ἀπόλωλα... μοι: the three resolutions in two lines reflect Phil.'s extreme emotional turmoil. At 742 and 745, in the grip of the disease, he said, ἀπόλωλα, τέκνον. Here, in Ne.'s grip, he strengthens ἀπόλωλα with a self-referential τλήμων and calls Ne. not τέκνον but ξένη, a far more distant term, shocking in the context, which he has not used since first greeting him at 219. Cf. 932n. ὡς τάχος = ὡς τάχιστα, an ionicism.

925 ἀλλ'... οἶόν τε: cf. *OC* 1418 and, for other instances of omitted ἐστί, *Tr.* 742, *OT* 24, *OC* 1136.

925–6 τῶν... ποῖ 'for both what is right and what is expedient make me heed those in authority'. Ne.'s abstract substantives in 926, each formed by adding the def. art. to a neut. adj., are Odyssean: cf. 109 τὸ σωθῆναι, 131 τὰ συμφέροντα with 131n. τῶν... ἐν τέλει strikes an Attic note, cf. 385n.

927–62 For thirty-six lines Phil. accuses, implores, flatters, and curses Ne., trying to persuade him to return the bow and expressing his own sense of betrayal. The speech has three main parts: (1) 927–35, in which Phil. both attacks Ne. for stealing the bow and implores him to return it; (2) 936–51, in which Phil. first apostrophizes the physical elements of the island, including its 'wild mountain beasts' and jutting, rocky cliffs (936–7) – telling them how Ne. has taken advantage of his weakness to deceive and betray him – then tries and fails in an attempt to make meaningful contact with Ne. himself, who remains silent in the face of Phil.'s direct appeal; (3) 952–62, in which Phil. apostrophizes his cave, where he will now perish helplessly and where, by a kind of natural, expiatory justice, he himself will provide a meal for the birds and beasts off whom he had fed – all because he was deceived by the apparently innocent Ne., whom he ends by cursing – 'if you will not change your mind again' (961–2). Phil.'s speech is technically a 'monologue', in the sense that he speaks uninterruptedly for thirty-six lines, but he is constantly striving for dialogue with the silent Ne., even when he addresses his natural surroundings and his cave. Cf. Schadewaldt 1926: 66–7, Reinhardt 1979: 183–4, Medda 1983: 135–7.

927–9 ὦ πῦρ... ἡπάτηκας: Phil. speaks with rising emotional intensity in rhetorical units of increasing length, from ὦ πῦρ σύ (3 syllables) to καὶ πᾶν δεῖμα (4 syllables) to καὶ πανουργίας | δεινῆς τέχνημ' ἔχθιστον (12 syllables). Fire in Greek literature may symbolize ruthless destruction, from its figurative association in the *Iliad* with Achilles at his most devastating (e.g. 18.205–14, 19.375–380; 21.522–5, 22.134–5; cf. Whitman 1958: 128–53) to its use by the Chorus at *Ar. Eq.* 382–3 to describe Paphlagon's (Kleon's) shameless political speeches: 'So after all there are other things hotter than fire and <speeches> | more shameless than the shameless speeches in the city'. Cf. 799–801n. on 'Lemnian fire'. Yet in addition to suggesting ruthless destruction, 927 πῦρ has a Sophistic and, in particular, an Odyssean resonance by its association with πανουργία (cf. 408) and τέχνημα (928, cf. 80 τεχνᾶσθαι). In *Od.* 9, Od.'s triumph over the Kyklops is

imaged as that of cunning intelligence and technology involving fire over brute force and the technologically primitive (cf. *Od.* 9.375–6, 384–8, 391–4). Insofar as Phil. is a kind of Polyphemos-figure, living in primitive conditions in an island cave and susceptible to deception by sophisticated visitors (cf. 146–7n., *Introd.*, p. 17), the play seems to be modelled on *Od.* 9. (At the same time, however, Phil., trapped on the island in a state of symbolic death, resembles Odysseus on Ogygia (cf. 1n.), and elsewhere Phil. is associated with Achilles (cf. 1447 with 1445–7n.) and with Her. These contrasting epic and heroic models help to give the play its distinctive complexity. See Schein 2006a: 131–4, *Introd.*, pp. 15–16.) **πᾶν δέϊμα** ‘total terror’, i.e. a man utterly terrifying and thus utterly monstrous toward others, cf. 622, *El.* 301 ἡ πᾶσα βλάβη. **πανουργίας . . . ἐχθιστον:** ‘a most detested contrivance of terrible villainy’. **τέχνημα** can refer to anything that is a product of art or craft (cf. 36). The word, however, is used elsewhere in tragedy specifically of ‘deceitful’ tricks or contrivances, e.g. Aesch. fr. 322 κᾶπηλα προσφέρων τεχνήματα ‘applying huckster-like trickery’, Eur. *IT* 1355 δόλια τεχνήματ’. **οἱ ἡπάτηκας:** exclamatory οἶα at the beginning of this and the previous clause effectively communicates Phil.’s urgency. He speaks to Ne. as he does to the foot that torments him (786; cf. 940, *Tr.* 1203 οἶά μ’ εἰργασαι, Eur. *Hipp.* 683 οἱ εἰργάσω με). For οἶα in other expressions of suffering and hatred, cf. 991, 1004.

929–30 οὐδ’ . . . σφέτλιε: Phil.’s incredulous question appeals to Ne. in terms of epic-heroic (ἐπαισχύνῃ) and religious (προστροπαιον, τὸν ἱκέτην) values; cf. 773 πρόστροπον. ὁρῶν implies that as Phil. says the words προστροπαιον, τὸν ἱκέτην, he falls to his knees in a ritual gesture of supplication and remains in that posture until the end of 935. Contrast 468–70 with n.

931–4 In four lines, the first three of which are marked by emphatic asyndeton and each of which consists of a complete sentence, Phil. moves from addressing Ne. in the indic. (ἀπεστέρηκας) to exhorting (ἀπόδος, μὴ ἀφέλῃ) and beseeching (ἰκνοῦμαι, ἱκετεύω) him, to speaking about him in the third person (οὐδὲ προσφωνεῖ).

931 ἀπεστέρηκας . . . ἐλὼν ‘you have robbed (me) of my life, having taken my bow’, cf. 1282–3. For the double acc. construction in 933, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 360 ἀφελεῖν τινα τάσδε μερίμνας. Normally ἀφαιρέω takes an acc. of the thing and a dat. (or, less frequently, gen.) of the person, cf. LSJ s.v. 1.1. βίον ‘life’ plays on βίον ‘bow’, cf. Heraklitos fr. 48 τῷ οὖν τόξῳ ὄνομα βίος, ἔργον δὲ θάνατος. Phil. evokes compassion by reminding not only the Chorus but a viewer or reader that Ne. has robbed him of his life by stealing the bow that enabled him to remain alive. Cf. 165–6, 287–9, 953–6, 1108–11.

932 ἀπόδος . . . τέκνον: a remarkable line rhetorically and metrically, with three resolutions, two in the repeated imper. ἀπόδος and one in ἱκετεύω, which itself repeats and reinforces cognate ἰκνοῦμαι. The repetitions, resolutions, and broken rhythm reflect Phil.’s urgency and distress; cf. the effect of double resolution in 794, 1018, 1029. Phil. alternates between second and first pers. verbs;

τέκνον at the end of the line reinforces σ' at the caesura, as he tries, rhetorically, to restore his relationship with his 'child'.

933 πρὸς . . . πατρῶϊων 'by your ancestral gods', i.e. the gods of your father, your grandfather, Peleus, and your great-grandfather, Aiakos, the son of Zeus. Cf. *OC* 756. Cults of 'ancestral gods', including family tomb cults, were common throughout Greece. Moreover an Athenian audience would have been reminded specifically of the cults in each city household of Apollo Patroios and Zeus Herkeios, which indicated that the family belonged to the Athenian religious and civic communities (cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 55.3). For synizesis of ε and ω in θεῶν, cf. 196n. μή ἀφέλῃ: Elmsley's emendation restores mid. for act. in conformity with normal Sophoklean usage: cf. 376, 1303, *Aj.* 100, cf. *OT* 1522 ἔλῃ. For synizesis of μή with following ἀ-, cf. *OT* 1388 τὸ μή ἀποκλῆσαι, *El.* 1169 μὴ ἀπολείπεσθαι.

934 ὦμοι τάλας: cf. 622, 995 οἴμοι τάλας, *OT* 744. Phil. also refers to himself as τάλας at 956, 959, 1083, 1187, and 1189, and the Chorus does so at 1196. Cf. 1101 ὦ τλάμων, τλάμων.

934–5 προσφωνεῖ . . . πάλιν: cf. 1066–7 οὐδέ σοῦ φωνῆς ἔτι | γενήσομαι πρόσφθεγκτος. Phil. speaks of Ne. in the third person (cf. 910), as he spoke of the disease at 743–4, 758–9, 787–8, 807–8 (Medda 1983: 140). ὥς . . . πάλιν: μή in μήποθ' is 'generic', i.e. used of Ne. as one of a general class or group who 'will never give . . . up' the bow (Jebb); cf. 170, 253, 415 with n., 1006, 1161. ὧδ' is redundant but gives ὥς, of which it is the antecedent, clarity and emphasis. Cf. 1247–8 with n., Campbell, *Essay* 74–5 §40.2. ὧδ' . . . πάλιν suggests that Ne. has turned his back on Phil. or at least is looking away, as Phil. supplicates him from his knees (see 929–30n.). Cf. Eur. *Ilec.* 343–4 πρόσωπον ἔμπαλιν | στρέφοντα. For μεθήσω, cf. 973.

936–51 Phil., cut off from human contact by Ne.'s silence and refusal even to look at him, struggles to his feet and turns to the natural features of the island with which he has lived for so long.

936–7 ὦ λιμένες . . . πέτραι 'o bays, o projecting headlands, o companionships of wild mountain beasts, o steep and precipitous rocks'. Phil. mentions the elements of the Lemnian landscape that meet his eye as he looks around from the place where he and Ne. are standing. λιμένες can mean 'bays' rather than 'harbours' and thus does not contradict Phil.'s claim at 302 that Lemnos has no ὄρμος. Cf. *Il.* 1.432–5, where the sailors row to a ὄρμος 'mooring' within the λιμένος πολυβενθέος 'very deep bay'. προβλήτες is substantival (= ἄκραι, ἄκται, or πέτραι), though προβλήτης is always an adj. in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 2.396 προβλήτι σκοπέλῳ, *Od.* 5.405, 10.89 ἄκται δὲ προβλήτες. καταρρώγες occurs only here in surviving Greek literature before Hesychios. It is probably equivalent to ἀπορρώγες ('broken off', 'sheer', 'precipitous'), though Σ glosses καταρρώγες πέτραι as κοιλώδεις τόποι 'cavernous places', presumably referring either to rock-caves like Phil.'s or to steep ravines or canyons. ξυνουσία . . . ὀρίων suggests the replacement of human society by the companionship of wild animals. Cf.

184–5, 180–90n. At 520 Phil. speaks of his ξυνουσία with his disease, cf. 265–9 ἄγρῳ | νόσῳ . . . | . . . | ξὺν ᾧ μ' ἐκείνοι . . . προθέντες ἐνθάδε | ὥχοντ' ἔρημον.

938–9 ὑμῖν . . . εἰωθόσιν 'these things I lament out loud to you – for I do not know another to whom I might speak – (you who are) used to being present (for me)'. τάδε is proleptic (and therefore emphatic), anticipating and made more specific by 940 οἱ ἔργα . . .

940 ὁ παῖς . . . οὐξ Ἀχιλλέως: Phil. speaks of Ne. in the third person from 940 through to 948. οὐξ Ἀχιλλέως at the end of the line is emphatic, conveying Phil.'s surprise that 'the son of Achilles' (of all people) would do such things.

941–2 ὁμόσας . . . δεξιάν: a mutual grasp of right hands often accompanies an alliance or solidarity sealed with oaths. Cf. 811 13n., Eur. *Med.* 21 2 βοῶν μὲν ὀρκους, ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δεξιᾶς | πίστιν μεγίστην, 495–6 σύννοισθ' αὖ γ' εἰς ἔμ' οὐκ εὐορκος ὦν. | φεῦ δεξιὰ χεῖρ. Actually, Ne. never promises or swears to bring Phil. home. At 526 7 he says, 'But if it seems best, let's sail; let him set forth quickly. | For the ship will bring (him) and will not refuse.' At 811, Phil. explicitly does not put Ne. on oath, and in 813 they shake hands only on Ne.'s promise not to abandon him while he is sleeping. But here and throughout the rest of the play (cf. 1398–9), Phil. clings to his own sense of what Ne. had promised, and Ne. does not contradict him.

943 ἱερά (sc. δυντα) not only reflects Phil.'s sense of the bow as belonging to the deified Herakles, but foreshadows its role as the instrument with which destiny and Zeus will bring about the sack of Troy.

944 φήνασθαι is the only occurrence in surviving Greek lit. of the aor. mid. inf. of φαίνω. It conveys Phil.'s sense that Ne. desires to 'show off' the bow to the Argives for his own credit (Moorhouse 178).

945 ὥς . . . ἄγει is an indignant amplification of 941 ἐς Τροίαν μ' ἄγει. ἐκ βίας: cf. 563, 985, 90n.

946 κοῦκ . . . νεκρόν: cf. *Ant.* 1030 τίς ἀλκή τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν; For Phil.'s disease and isolation on Lemnos as a form of death, cf. 311 with n., 624–5, 1018, 1030; Mauduit 1995: 341–9, *Introd.*, p. 16.

946–7 καπνοῦ . . . ἄλλως 'smoke's shadow, an image merely', a remarkable condensation of imagery traditionally associated with human worthlessness, feebleness, and mortality. For ἄλλως = μάτην 'in vain', cf. *OT* 333 ἄλλως ἐλέγχεις, 1151 ἄλλως πονεῖ, LSJ s.v. π.3. For καπνοῦ σκιάν, as an expression of worthlessness, cf. *Ant.* 1170–1 τέλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς | οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην. σκιά expresses human feebleness in Aesch. fr. 154a (from *Niobe*) . . . κακωθεὶς δ' οὐδὲν ἄλλ' εἰ[] μὴ σκιά, and Pind. *Pyth.* 8.95–6 σκιᾶς ὄναρ | ἀνθρώπος. εἰδῶλα and εἰδῶλον can describe feeble human beings in general (e.g. *Aj.* 126 εἰδῶλ' . . . ἡ καπνοῦ σκιάν, Aesch. *Ag.* 839 εἰδῶλον σκιᾶς), but Phil. uses the image of himself (cf. Oidipous at *OC* 109–10 Οἰδίπου τὸν ἄθλιον | εἰδῶλον). In addition, coming so soon after νεκρόν and σκιάν, εἰδῶλον evokes the Homeric formula εἰδῶλα καμόντων (*Il.* 23.72, *Od.* 11.476, 24.14), as well as the use of εἰδῶλον for the individual 'images'

or 'shades' Od. meets on the way to, or in, the Homeric land of the dead (*Od.* 11.83, 213, 602, 20.355; cf. *Il.* 23.104). For σκιά and σκιάι used of the 'shades' of the dead, cf. *Od.* 10.495, 11.207.

947–8 οὐ . . . δόλωι lit. 'for he would never have taken me, if I had my strength; for not even being thus as I am (would he have taken me), if not by guile'. ἐν in 947 goes with εἶλεν in the apodosis of a past contrary-to-fact condition, the protasis of which is implied by the circumstantial σθένοντά γε . . . με. ἐν in 948 goes with an understood, second εἶλεν in the apodosis of a second contrary-to-fact condition, the protasis of which is implied by ὧδ' ἔχοντα. ἐπει οὐδ': for the synizesis of -ει and ου-, cf. 446, 1037.

949 νῦν δ' . . . δύσμορος 'but as it is I have been deceived, ill-fated (as I am)'. νῦν δ' marks a return from the contrary-to-fact conditions to the present reality.

950 (ἀλλ) . . . γενοῦ: Turnebus' conjecture restores both the missing syllable and the idiomatic repetition of ἀλλά after a short interval in a command or exhortation (*GP* 15). Cf. 1040 1, Eur. *Her.* 622 4 ἀλλ' εἴ ὁμαρτεῖτ', ὦ τέκν' . . . ἀλλὰ θάρσος ἴσχετε. For ἀλλά νῦν 'but (even) now', cf. *El.* 411 συγγένεσθέ γ' ἀλλά νῦν. Phil. returns to the second person, urging Ne. to 'become in yourself (again)', i.e. to return to your φύσις from which you have departed. Cf. 79–80, 902–3, Pind. *Pyth.* 2.72 γένοι' ὅλος ἐσσι μωθών.

951–60 As Ne. remains silent (951 τί φῆις; σιωπᾶις), Phil. turns again to his natural environment, beginning with an invocation of his own cave. Cf. 927 62n.

951 σιωπᾶις can be understood as a statement or a question (direct or rhetorical). Either way, it expresses a combination of incredulity, anger, and regret.

952 ὦ σχῆμα . . . δίπυλον: lit. 'O visible shape of rock with two doorways'. σχῆμα properly denotes external shape as perceived visually. For its use in the vocative as part of a periphrasis denoting a dwelling seen from a certain distance, cf. Eur. *Alc.* 911 ὦ σχῆμα δόμων, *Her.* 619 ὦ σχῆματ' οἴκων. In these passages, the periphrasis implies a change in the fortune, wealth, or happiness of the dwelling and its inhabitants, as well as an emptiness now that something vital is gone, which had made the dwelling a 'home' – in this case, the bow and arrows with which Phil. had sustained life (cf. 953); cf. Catoni 2005: 98. δίπυλον is boldly transferred by hypallage from πέτρας to σχῆμα, a figure made easier because σχῆμα πέτρας is, as it were, a single conception; cf. 999–1000n.

954 αὐανοῦμαι 'I will wither and dry up', a metaphor from plant life. Cf. *Od.* 9.321 αὐανθέν, of a branch cut from a tree, *El.* 819 ἀφίλος αὐανῶ βιον. The MSS have αὐ θανοῦμαι, but Σ preserves the correct reading: 'write αὐανοῦμαι as the equivalent to ξηρανθήσομαι'. ἐν αὐλίωι: cf. 19n.

955 πτηνὸν . . . δρειβάτην suggests the distance from Phil. of the prey which he no longer can hunt without his bow and arrows.

956 τοισίδι: this Ionic form occurs in tragedy here, at Aesch. *Ag.* 520, and c. fifteen times in Eur. Cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 520, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 400.

956–9 ἄλλ'... τάλας 'but I myself, wretched, having died will provide a feast (for those) by whom I was fed, and (those) whom I used to hunt before will now hunt me; and I will pay my blood as compensation (or: 'in reprisal') for (their) blood'. With this emotional language, Phil. humanizes the birds and beasts among whom he lives, since blood paid for blood shed is normal practice in a human blood-feud. The humanization continues with ὕφ' ὦν, which indicates the personal agency of Phil.'s former prey and suggests that in killing them, he made them his 'feeders'. Wunder *ad loc.* suggested ἄφ' for ὕφ', because this agency seemed to him too strained. ἄφ' could be right, but ὕφ' seems more in line with Phil.'s intense emotion throughout this speech.

φόνον... τείσω: ῥύσιον, perhaps cognate with ἐρύω 'draw', 'drag', may have originally denoted something drawn or dragged away as compensation, payment, or reprisal (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 535 τοῦ ῥυσίου ἡμαρτε). From the perspective of the person from whom a thing is 'drawn', ῥύσιον would have signified 'something paid as a punishment' (LSJ *s.v.* ῥύσιον π.1). For φόνον φόνου... τείσω, cf. *OT* 100–1 φόνωι φόνον... | λύνοντας. For similar word-play, cf. 296 ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον, 1002 πέτραι πέτρας, *Aj.* 866 πόνος πόνωι πόνον φέρει. φόνου is gen. of price, dependent on ῥύσιον. For τείσω (from τίνω 'pay', 'expiate'), cf. *Aj.* 113 τέισι... δίκην, *OT* 810 οὐ μὴν ἴσῃν γ' (*sc.* δίκην) ἔτεισεν.

960 πρὸς... κακόν 'from (i.e. 'because of') the man who seemed to know no evil'. For the imperf. force of the participle, cf. *Ant.* 1192 παρών ἐρῶ, *OT* 834–5 ἕως δ' ἂν οὖν | πρὸς τοῦ παρόντος ἐκμάθῃς, *OC* 1565–6 πολλῶν... πημάτωι ἰκνουμένων.

961–2 ὄλοιο... κακῶς 'may you perish – (but) not yet, until I learn if in fact you will change your mind back again (i.e. "reverse your purpose"); but if not, may you die foully'. Phil. begins to curse Ne., then qualifies his curse to give Ne. a chance to change his mind. μάθοιμ' is opt. by attraction or assimilation to the mood of ὄλοιο. Cf. 325 γνοῖεν after 324 γένοιτο, *Tr.* 655–7 μὴ σταίη... πρὶν... ἀνύσειε, Smyth §2186b, *GMT* §643. καὶ goes closely with πάλιν, giving emphasis and 'a sense of climax', as often when it precedes an adj. or adv. (*GP* 317–19). Cf. 1270 καὶ μεταγνῶνα πάλιν with n., and for this sense of γνώμη, cf. 1192.

963–1080 Ne., though clearly moved by Phil.'s long speech (cf. 965–6), does not respond until the Chorus remind him that he is their king and must decide now whether they will set sail for Troy with the bow or give in to Phil.'s words (963–4). But at this point Ne. admits that 'a terrible pity has... long since fallen on me' (965), and when Phil. tries to exploit this pity and urges Ne. 'not to provide mortals with matter for reproaching [him]' (967–8), Ne. is at a loss (969) and turns to the Chorus, seeking the same counsel from them that they had sought from him just a few lines earlier (963): 'men, what should we do?' (974). This is *the* 'tragic question' of a play so deeply concerned with moral agency (Rehm 2003: 83). It is asked repeatedly by Ne. (757, 895, 908, 974), Phil. (949, 1063, 1350), and the Chorus (963, 1191), but (significantly) never by Od.; cf. Roisman 2005: 61.

Phil. continues to put pressure on Ne. to return the bow, and he is about to do so, when Od. intervenes to prevent this (974–5). It is striking that for the next 100 lines – from the middle of 975 to 1073 – Ne. remains silent, as Phil. and Od. quarrel fiercely; then, when Phil. appeals to Ne. directly, Od. does not let him reply (1066–9). Only when Od. and Ne. prepare to return to the ship, after Phil. asks if the Chorus too will leave and not take pity on him, and they respond that their doing so depends on Ne.'s decision, does Ne. finally speak – not to Phil. but only to his men, telling them that they are free to stay until the ship is ready to sail, but then must come quickly (1074–80). Ne.'s silences earlier in the play are strategic: e.g. at 220–9, when he does not immediately respond to Phil.'s first speech (cf. 230), and at 468–506, when he seems hesitant to grant the rescue for which Phil. appeals. By contrast, his silences at 927–62 and 974–1073 are a sign of his helplessness. Ne. becomes a passive, 'on stage' audience before whom Phil. and Od. enact their quarrel, leaving the theatre audience to generate their own judgements about what he can, should, and will do, thus heightening the ethical complexity of the play. Cf. Goldhill 2009: 31–6, Intro., pp. 24–5.

963–4 τί . . . λόγοις: 'what should we do? It is now up to you, king, both whether we sail and whether we accede to this man's words'. The Chorus speak, although Phil. had been addressing Ne., which suggests that he looks to them, both physically and figuratively, for guidance. For ἐν σοί, cf. Eur. *Alc.* 278 ἐν σοί δ' ἔσμεν καὶ ζῆν καὶ μὴ, *IT* 1057–8 καὶ τᾶμ' ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν ἡ καλῶς ἔχειν | ἡ μὴ δὲν εἶναι. προσχωρεῖν 'accede to', comply with' is more common in prose than in poetry, but cf. Eur. *Med.* 222 χρηρὲ δὲ ξένον μὲν κάρτα προσχωρεῖν πόλει. The word usually suggests a dilemma, a clear choice between two courses of action; cf. LSJ s.v. π.2. Though lacking the definite article, the inf. is parallel to τὸ πλεῖν in 963 and has the same subject, ἡμᾶς.

965–6 ἐμοὶ . . . πάλαι: for μὲν giving emphasis to a personal pronoun, with no corresponding δέ, see, e.g., 995, 1218. ἐμπίπτωκε 'has fallen on me' suggests that the 'strange pity' has made itself felt against Ne.'s will. τοῦδ' ἀνδρός is obj. gen. governed by the verbal force in οἶκτος. For πάλαι, cf. 589, 806, 906, 913. In all but the first of these passages, Ne.'s use of this word, along with language denoting the pain or pity he has 'long since' been feeling at Phil.'s suffering and at his own role in deceiving him, opens a window into Ne.'s internal, ethical struggle. Cf. Perrotta 1935: 423, Masaracchia 1964: 97, Pucci 264, Jouanna 2004: 29–35.

967–70 Phil. tries to profit from Ne.'s οἶκτος δεινός (for ἐλέησον, cf. 501), urging him 'not to furnish mortals with matter for reproach of yourself'. This language associates Phil. with an epic-heroic value-system familiar from the *Iliad*, where public reproach and the shame resulting from it are the most important sanctions on individual behaviour (cf. *Il.* 16.498–9 σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφέει καὶ θνείδους | ἔσσομαι, 17.556–7). This association is strengthened by Phil.'s use of ἐλέησον, an Ionic form regularly employed in Homeric supplications (e.g. *Il.* 21.74 γουνοῦμαί σ', Ἀχιλεῦ· σὺ δὲ μ' αἶδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέησον, cf. 22.59, 82,

24.503). Caught between the Iliadic values evoked by βροτοῖς δνειδος and the value implicit in ἐκκλέψας, the word with which Od. had first instructed him in the need to deceive Phil. (cf. 55 with n.), Ne. bursts forth with οἶμοι, τί δράσω. Although the Chorus have just reminded him that everything is up to him (963-4), all he can do is to wish that he had never left home, so burdened is he by his present circumstances. μή . . . δνειδος 'don't furnish to mortals matter for reproach of yourself'. σαντοῦ is obj. gen. dependent on δνειδος 'matter for reproach'; cf. *Aj.* 1191 δνειδος Ἑλλάνων, *OC* 984 αὐτῆς δνειδος. With σαντόν, the easier reading found in several MSS, the meaning would be 'don't provide yourself to mortals as matter for reproach'.

971-2 οὐκ . . . αἰσχροῖς 'you are not evil, but you seem to have come (here) having learned shameful things from evil men'. σύ, as the final word of its clause and placed before a strong sense-break at the caesura, is particularly emphatic. αἰσχροῖς at the caesura in 972, before an even stronger sense-break, and dependent on but separated from μαθών, is similarly forceful.

974-5 τί δρώμεν . . . πάλιν: Ne.'s heartfelt question, implying that he cannot continue to hold out against Phil.'s supplication (cf. 908-9n.) and asking the Chorus for guidance (cf. 969, 967-70n.), suggests that he is wavering. There are two ways to interpret what happens next: (1) probably, as Ne. moves toward Phil. to return the bow, Od., who has been lurking nearby out of sight, bursts forth at the critical moment, either from the cave (he would be understood to have entered it by the opening that is not visible to the audience) or by approaching, unseen by Phil., along the *eisodos*. Od. is accompanied by two attendants (cf. 985 οἶδ', 1003 ξυλλαβέτον); he is first heard in 974-5 and first seen when he comes forward in 977. He interrupts Ne. in the middle of 974, prevents him from approaching Phil. (975 οὐκ εἴ . . . πάλιν, cf. *OC* 1398 νῦν τ' ἴθ' ὡς τάχος πάλιν), and demands that Ne. hand over the bow. Od. clearly has been close enough to hear what has just been said: his τί δρᾷς is a kind of 'ironic echo' of Ne.'s τί δρώμεν (cf. Fraenkel 1977: 68); his ὦ κάκιστ' ἀνδρῶν similarly echoes Phil.'s οὐκ εἴ κακὸς σύ· πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν μαθών in 971; and his μεθεῖς looks back to Phil.'s use of the same word at 973 and implies 'having given up this bow to me (and not to Phil.)'. (2) possibly, Ne. is not moving toward Phil. to return the bow, when Od. interrupts in the middle of 974. Rather, when Od. hears the words τί δρώμεν, ἄνδρες, he realizes that Ne. is unable to continue holding out against Phil.'s supplication, intervenes with the sarcastic and insulting ὦ κάκιστ' ἀνδρῶν, τί δρᾷς, and demands that he turn around, come to where Od. is standing (behind him, cf. 975 οὐκ εἴ . . . πάλιν), and hand over the bow (cf. Ferrari 1983: 56, Pucci 272-3). With either staging, Od.'s unexpected, unannounced entry is highly effective dramatically. Cf. Taplin 1971: 27-8, Fraenkel 1977: 68-9. **976-1003** Phil. immediately recognizes the sound of Od.'s voice, confirming Od.'s assumption that Phil. will identify him (75), should they meet. Phil. has a distinctive sensitivity to the sound of voices: cf. his eagerness to hear Ne. speak at 225 and 229, his joy on hearing him do so (234-5), and his later distress at the

thought of not being spoken to by Ne.'s voice, when Ne. and Od. are about to depart for the ship (1066-7). The dialogue between Od. and Phil. rises in intensity, until Od. commands his men to restrain Phil. physically (1003). Od. and Phil. speak mainly in exchanges of one or two lines, with impatient interruptions in the middle of the line by Od. at 981, 985, and 994 (cf. 54 with n.) and by Phil. at 1001, and with an outburst by Phil. at 986-8, when Od. threatens to have him brought to Troy by force. Ne. remains silent even when addressed by Phil. in 981 and spoken of by Od. in 981-2.

976-7 ἀρ'... εἰσορᾷς 'do I hear Odysseus? Od. (Yes, you hear) Odysseus, know (this) clearly, *me*, whom you look on'. As he speaks 977, Od. moves forward so that Phil. can see him. Od.'s genitives in 977 are dependent on Phil.'s κλύω in 976. The successive semantic breaks in 977 at positions 4, 6 (bisecting the line), and 8, give the line unusual roughness and force. σάφ' ἴσθ' is a kind of verbal tic on the part of Od., suggesting 'command of the situation at the moment his σόφισμα triumphs' (Pucci 273). Cf. 980, 1296, and Ne. at 122, when he has just consented to act in an 'Odyssean' fashion.

978 πέπραμαι κάπολωλ' 'I have been sold and I am lost' is strongly emotional, especially with repeated οἶμοι (cf. 976). For ἀπόλωλ(α), cf. 742, 745, 923, δῖλλυμι (686, 1105-6, 1172, 1388) and ἀπόλλυμι (311, 923, 978, 1187, 1356) recur with increasing emotional intensity throughout the play, as Phil. moves from feeling destroyed by his disease and abandonment ten years earlier to utter despair at his fresh betrayal by Ne. and victimization by Od. πέπραμαι, perf. pass. of πέρνημι/πιπράσκω, can also imply betrayal, like other verbs of buying and selling when applied to free human beings, e.g. 579 διεμπολᾷ, *Ag.* 978 ἡμπόληκας, *Aesch. Ag.* 1041 πραθέντα. Here πέπραμαι expresses Phil.'s sense of powerlessness and loss of agency (cf. 995-6). Probably this use of mercantile language is colloquial, though there are no parallels in extant comedy; cf. Rossi and Fraenkel in Fraenkel 1977: 69-70. It certainly is appropriate here, as in the False Merchant scene (cf. 578-9 with n., Østerud 1973: 23-4).

978-9 δδ'... δπλων: ἀρα indicates the truth dawning on Phil., cf. 996, 1083. For its position in the sentence, cf. 1083, *GP* 41. με is felt with both ξυλλαβῶν and κάποννοσφισας.

980 σάφ'... τάδε 'I (am the one), know (it) clearly, not another (trapped and robbed you), I admit this.' Od. speaks with boastful pride and a touch of scorn (cf. 976-7n.): only now can Phil. clearly understand how clever Od. has been and what he, and no one else, has done to him. ὁμολογῶ understatedly expresses Od.'s pride in the success of his plan.

981-3 ἀπόδος... στελοῦσί σε: Phil. appeals to Ne. to return the bow, but Od. interrupts and answers for him, saying that this will never happen and that in addition (ἄλλὰ καί) Phil. 'must' come to Troy or be conveyed by force. ἀφες 'release' is more general than ἀπόδος 'give back'; cf. 973 μεθεῖς. Od. does not specify the nature of the necessity expressed by 982 δεῖ or by the verbal adjectives in 993-4 and δεῖ in 998. Cf. 50-1n. στείχειν... αὐτοῖσι the antecedent

of αὐτοῖς is 981 τὰ τόξα – Phil. must come to Troy with the bow. Cf. 1059 τούτων referring to 1056 τὰ . . . ὅπλα.

984 ἐμ', . . . τολμήσσετε ('will they convey) *me*, you most evil of evil men and most bold?'. Cf. *OC* 1384 κακὼν κάκιστε. τολμήσσετε is vocative superlative of τολμήεις – the only example in extant Attic tragedy of an adj. ending in -ήεις, if Bothe's σαρξὶ φοινίαισιν for σάρκα φωνήεσσιν is correct at Eur. *Trö.* 440; cf. Jackson 1955: 126–7, 242). The unusual contraction of τολμήεσσετε led to the MS variant τολμίσσετε, but superlatives in -ίστατος 'always imply a positive in -ης or -ος and occur only in Comedy or in late prose' (Jebb). Cf. *Il.* 18.475 τιμῆντα (contracted from τιμήντα).

985 μὴ ῥππις: for the prodelision, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 828 μὴ 'τέρωσε, *Lys.* 736 αὐτὴ 'τέρα, *Ran.* 64 ἢ 'τέραι. Given Phil.'s difficulty walking, ῥππις is mocking and cruel. Cf. 1060 πατῶν.

986–7 τὸ . . . Ἡφαιστότευκτον 'the all-conquering blaze wrought by Hephaistos'. For the voc. joined with nom., cf. 867–8; for the position of Ἡφαιστότευκτον, cf. 391–3n. τό is demonstrative and is accompanied by a gesture in the direction of the volcanic Mt Mosychlos, which perhaps was the original basis of the association of Hephaistos with Lemnos. Cf. 799–801n., Antimachos of Colophon fr. 46 Wyss = 52 Matthews 'like the flame of Hephaistos which the god prepares on the highest peaks of Mount Mosychlos'; *Il.* 1.593–4, *Od.* 8.283–4, Masciadri 2008: 242–3. On the affinities between Hephaistos and Phil., see Morin 2003: 405–12.

987–8 ταῦτα . . . βίαι 'is this really to be endured, if this man here will lead me away from *your* (precincts) by force?' 'Your', following 986 ὦ Λημνία χθῶν, refers to Lemnos and is emphatic, because τῶν σῶν is a word-group ending at position 6 with what amounts to middle caesura, since the word-end at position 5 is barely felt. εἰ with fut. indic. implies indignation, cf. *El.* 1210 τῆς σῆς εἰ στερήσομαι ταφῆς. δῆτα frequently follows ταῦτα, εἴτα, or ἐπειτα in questions indicating surprise or indignation, cf. *GP* 272. For ἀπάξεται, cf. 1029; for βίαι, cf. 90n.

989–90 Ζεὺς . . . ταῦθ': the triple repetition of Zeus is highly emphatic; ἴν' εἰδῆις adds a peremptory note, cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 439 ὥς τόδ' εἰδῆις and colloquial ἴσθι 'know' = 'let me tell you'. ὦι is dat. of agent with δέδοκται, cf. 1274. ἐγὼ gains emphasis by its position at the end of the line and the sentence. Od. justifies his actions with the claim that he is serving Zeus, as Ne. at 925 justifies his refusal to return the bow as obedience to 'those in authority'. In each case the speaker uses an impersonal verb (990 δέδοκται/925 οὐχ οἶόν τε) and in effect disclaims personal responsibility for his behaviour (cf. 50–1n.).

991 ὦ μῖσος 'Ο (you) object of hatred.' The abstract is more emphatic than, e.g., ὦ μισητέ, would be. Cf. 927–8, *Ant.* 760 ἄγετε τὸ μῖσος, *El.* 289 ὦ δῦσθεον μίσημα. οἶα . . . λέγειν 'what things you actually (καί) invent to say' (*not* 'you invent in addition'), cf. 929n. ἐξανευρίσκω does not occur elsewhere in Greek before Plut. λέγειν is expegetical inf., explaining κάξανευρίσκεις.

992 θεοὺς προτείνων ‘putting forth the gods before you as an excuse (behind which to shelter yourself)’, i.e. as authorizing or justifying your actions. Cf. Eur. *Andr.* 427–8 ἵν’ ἄγνόν βωμὸν ἐκλίποις θεᾶς, | προὔτεινα παιδὸς θάνατον ‘I put forth the death of your child as an excuse, so that you would leave the goddess’s pure altar’, Eur. *El.* 1067–8.

τοὺς . . . τίθης ‘you make the gods false’, i.e. make them responsible for your deceit. Phil. is not saying that Od. makes them liars, because he (Phil.) will not be persuaded to go to Troy in accordance with Helenos’ prophecy (cf. 610–13), though this is how Od. understands him, to judge from his response in 993, οὐκ, ἀλλ’ ἄληθεῖς (see 993n.). Cf. 452, where Phil. considers the gods κακοὺς, i.e. responsible for κακά. For the definite article with repeated θεοὺς, cf. *OC* 277–8 καὶ μὴ θεοὺς τιμῶντες εἴτα τοὺς θεοὺς | μῶρους ποιεῖσθε μηδαμῶς.

993 οὐκ . . . ἄληθεῖς ‘No, (I make them) true’, i.e. ‘true prophets’, with τίθημι understood from Phil.’s τίθης in the previous line. Cf. 992n. ἡ . . . πορευτέα ‘the road must be travelled (by you)’. *Sc.* ἐστὶ σοί, but the sheer necessity is more starkly expressed by omission of the copulative and dat. of agent. Cf. 982–3 with 981–3n. For the antithesis, cf. *El.* 1501 πολλὰ ἀντιφωνεῖς, ἡ δ’ ὁδὸς βραδύνεται.

994 οὐ φημί. *Od.* ἐγὼ δὲ φημί ‘I say (the road must) not (be travelled)’. ‘But I say (it must be travelled)’. Gernhard’s correction, anticipated by Markland, is necessary: with the reading of the MSS, οὐ φημί ἔγωγε. *Od.* φημί, *Od.* would be agreeing with Phil. rather than expressing his insistent opposition to Phil.’s assertion. Enclitic φημί retains its accent because it is emphatic, in contrast to Phil.’s οὐ φημί’. πιστεύον τάδε: *sc.* σοί, ‘there must be obedience in this (by you)’. Cf. 993n.

995–6 ἡμᾶς . . . ἐλευθέρους ‘clearly, then, my father begat us as slaves, and not as free men’. οὐδέ is equivalent to ἀλλ’ οὐ, a combination often used to separate such ‘incompatibles’ as slaves and free men (*GP* 191). ἡμᾶς, a ‘plural of modesty’ (cf. Smyth §1008, Moorhouse 8–9), conveys Phil.’s sense that if his body can be handled against his will and he must obey Od., he is not a free man. Cf. his attitude to being bought and sold at 578–9, 978. μέν lends emphasis to ἡμᾶς (cf. 965–6n.), but also is felt with δούλους in contrast to οὐδ’ ἐλευθέρους. ἄρα ‘then’ usually is postpositive but here comes late in the sentence, after Phil.’s emphatic opening words (Campbell, *Essay* 44§26). The enjambment makes σαφῶς and ἄρα a more forceful semantic unity.

998 κατασκάψαι ‘raze to the ground’, ‘utterly destroy’, is a strong word, used regularly in tragedy, like the cognate noun κατασκαφή, of the destruction of Troy and Thebes, e.g. *OC* 1318, Aesch. *Ag.* 525–6, Eur. *Hel.* 196–7.

999–1000 οὐδέποτε γ’ . . . βάθρον ‘Never (will I join with other *aristoi* to take and destroy Troy), even if I must suffer every evil (here on Lemnos)—at least while I have this steep pedestal of land’. γε is both intensive and limitative. For οὐδέποτε, cf. 1197, 1392, also expressing Phil.’s strong refusal to go to Troy voluntarily. οὐδ’ . . . κακόν is the protasis of a fut. more vivid condition, of which οὐδέποτε

γ' serves as the apodosis, to which Phil. emotionally adds ἕως γ' ... βάθρον as a second, supplementary protasis. For ἕως ὅν with the subj., cf. 1329-34n. βάθρον can denote 'that on which anything steps or stands' (LSJ, s.v.). Here it refers to the high, sheer cliff onto which Phil.'s cave opens, not to the whole island as at *Aj.* 859-60 ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον | Σαλαμῖνος, ὦ πατρῶιον ἐστίας βάθρον. Phil., Od., and Ne. are standing in front of the cave-mouth, and Phil. thinks of hurling himself from the cliff and taking his own life and perhaps makes a move to do so here or at 1001-2.

1001 ἐργασείεις: verbs ending in -σειω are 'desiderative', i.e. they express the desire to perform the action denoted by the verb from which they are derived. Cf. 1245 δρασείεις, *Aj.* 326 δρασείων. *Tr.* 1232 ἐργασείων. fr. 991 ἀκουσειών.

1001-2 κρᾶτ'... πεσών lit. 'this head of mine I will at once make bloody on the rock (below), having fallen from above, from the rock'. Phil.'s interruption in the middle of the line reflects his intense emotion (cf. 1275, 1277, 1280), and the juxtaposition of two different cases of πέτρα adds rhetorical force: πέτραι is locative dat., πέτρας is gen. of separation dependent on πεσών, a construction made smoother and clearer by adverbial ἀνωθεν coming between the two words. For πεσών 'having fallen' = 'having let myself fall', 'having thrown myself', cf. *Od.* 10.50-1... μεμῆριξα, | ἡὲ πεσών ἐκ νηὸς ἀποφθίμην ἐνὶ πόντῳ... κρᾶτ' is acc. sing. of κράς, a variant of κάρα. Cf. 1207, 1457.

1003 ξυλλάβετον: Bernhardy's conjecture is preferable both to the unmetrical ξυλλάβετ' found in the majority of MSS and to the unlikely ξυλλάβετέ γε in the others, where γ' is probably a conjecture meant to avoid hiatus between ξυλλάβετε and αὐτόν. (On the rare combination of imper. + γε, cf. *GP* 125, Diggle 1981: 22-3.) ξυλλάβετον refers to the two silent attendants who entered with Od., cf. 985 οἶδ' and 1054-5 ἄφετε... προσψάυσητ'... ἔατε. For the dual referring to the same persons also referred to in the plur., cf. *OC* 1437-8 μέθεσθε... χαίρετόν τ'... ἐσώψεσθ'. μὴ... τάδε 'let this not be in this man's power'. Cf. 1165-6 ἐπὶ σοὶ | κῆρα τάνδ' ἀποφεύγειν. τάδε refers to Phil.'s throwing himself from the rock, as he has just threatened to do. τῷδ' suggests a deictic gesture toward Phil., whom the two attendants at once seize and hold until 1054, when Od. orders him released.

1004-44 Phil. begins this forty-one-line speech with a two-line apostrophe to his 'hands' which Od.'s men have just 'hunted down', because they are defenceless without the bow. Then he launches an attack on Od.'s character and actions, in particular his exploitation of Ne. and past and present violence toward Phil. himself. He also curses the Greek army for its unjust treatment of him, claims that their present need for him at Troy shows that the gods are concerned with (retributive) justice (1035-9), and calls on the gods to pay them all back (1040-1). Throughout the speech, Phil. nowhere addresses Ne. directly, but as in 927-62, Ne.'s silence as he listens to Phil. 'strengthen[s] his presence' (Reinhardt 1979: 185) and invites audiences and readers to consider what Ne. must be thinking

and to evaluate for themselves the ethical validity of Phil.'s verbal attack on Od. and appeal to the gods for justice.

1004–5 ὦ χεῖρες . . . συνηρώμεναι: Phil. apostrophizes his hands, but the effect is quite different from when he apostrophizes his foot at 786. There, the foot is singled out as a part of the body that inflicts suffering on Phil.; here, the hands themselves 'suffer in need of [their] dear bowstring' and because they have been 'hunted' by 'this man'. The relationship between the hands and the 'need' in which Phil. finds himself is driven home by the play of sound in χεῖρες and χρεῖαι. The bowstring is 'dear' reciprocally: the hands liked to draw and care for it, and the bowstring 'cared for' Phil.'s hands and provided life-giving sustenance. Cf. 1128–9, Pucci 277. ἐν χρεῖαι: cf. 185–7n. ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε is bitter, disrespectful, and accompanied by a gesture toward Od. Contrast 1036 τὸν ἀνδρα τόνδε referring to Phil. himself.

συνηρώμεναι refers to both of Phil.'s hands having been hunted and, so to speak, captured, not to their being bound together. When Od. tells his men at 1003, 'Seize him', the ξυν- in ξυλλάβειτον refers to the two of them acting together, not to any binding of the hands. 1016 ἔμ' . . . συνδήσας does refer to binding, but there Phil. speaks anticipatorily of Od.'s intentions (cf. 1016 νοεῖς); he does not mean that he has already been bound.

1006 ὦ μηδὲν ὑγιές . . . φρονῶν 'O you who think in no wholesome way and in no way worthy of a free man.' μηδὲν ὑγιές and ἐλεύθερον are internal acc. with φρονῶν (cf. the idioms κακὰ φρονῶν, φίλα φρονῶν). For ἐλεύθερον = ἐλευθέριον, cf. *Tr.* 63 δοῦλη μὲν, εἵρηκεν δ' ἐλεύθερον λόγον, fr. 940 εἰ σῶμα δοῦλον, ἀλλ' ὁ νοῦς ἐλεύθερος. For μηδὲν used 'generically' instead of οὐδὲν to refer to a man 'of the kind to have no sound thoughts' (Jebb), cf. 409 μηδὲν δίκαιον, 934–5n. οὐδὲν/μηδὲν ὑγιές, a metaphorical phrase derived from the language of medicine, is colloquial and frequent in comedy, e.g. *Ar. Thesm.* 394, *Plut.* 37. See Stevens 1945: 99 and on *Eur. Andr.* 448 ἐλίκτὰ κοῦδὲν ὑγιές ἀλλὰ πᾶν περίξ | φρονοῦντες.

1007 οἶ . . . ὑπηλθες 'how you stole upon me deceptively again' (as you did ten years ago). Cf. *OT* 386 λάθραι μ' ὑπελθών, *Eur. Andr.* 435 δόλωι μ' ὑπηλθες. Compounds with ὑπό often signify something underhanded, insidious, or deceptive; cf. 1112 ὑπέδου, *OT* 387 ὑφείς.

1007–8 λαβών . . . ἐμοί 'having taken this boy, unknown to me, as your shield'. Cf. 72–3.

1009 ἀνάξιον . . . ἐμοῦ: the parallel construction and double rhyme within the line make it particularly emphatic. Cf. 1369, where middle caesura (cf. 101n.) has an effect similar to that of the emphatic monosyllable σοῦ at position 6, after the caesura and before a strong sense break; see too 907, 1017, 1021, 1049, 1056, 1298.

1010 οὐδὲν . . . πλὴν is colloquial, cf. *Ar. Vesps.* 1507, *Av.* 19, Fraenkel 1977: 72, Collard 2005: 372.

1011–12 δῆλος... παθόν lit. 'he is clear even now bearing painfully both (those things) in which he himself erred utterly and (those things) in which I suffered'. Phil. uses a personal construction, and with rhetorically effective anaphora (οἷς τ'... οἷς τ') and emphatic αὐτός and ἐγώ, he puts his own sufferings and Ne.'s errors on an equal footing, in an effort to influence Ne., even though he is speaking to Od. (Pucci 278). φέρων is suppl. participle with δῆλος... ἔστιν. φέρω is often combined with an adv. or a dat. indicating the manner or mood in which something is 'borne', 'taken', or 'felt' ('modal' dat.); cf. LSJ s.v. A.III.2. For ἀλγυνῶς, cf. 906 and 913 ἀνῶμαι, 965–6n. οἷς = τούτοις ἄ. παθόν is preferable to πάθον, because omission of the augment, though common in lyric passages, is extremely rare in iambic trimeter dialogue, except in messenger speeches, which in this respect as in others are modelled on epic. Cf. 371n., Smyth §438a, Barrett 2002: xvi–xviii, 40–9.

1013–15 ἄλλ'... σοφόν 'but your evil soul, on each occasion peering through secret places, taught him well step by step to be cunning in evils, though he was unsuited by nature and at the same time unwilling'. διὰ μυκῶν βλέπουσ' αἶψα suggests both the kind of spying the audience has just witnessed on the part of Od., as he lurked near the cave and eavesdropped on the conversation between Phil. and Ne., and an ingrained shiftiness of mind or soul. The spying is in keeping with the immediate, visible dramatic circumstances (cf. Od. at *Aj.* 2 πείραν τιν' ἐχθρῶν ἀρπάσαι θηρώμενον and *Aj.* 11–12). ψυχή ('habitual mental attitude', 'character', cf. 55, *Ant.* 176) gains emphasis from the hyperbaton in which it is separated from ἡ κακὴ σή in the previous line. Phil. speaks almost as if he had heard the discussion between Od. and Ne. in the Prologue: cf. 79–80, 88, 119. For προὔδιδασκεν connoting 'step by step' or 'gradual' teaching, cf. 538 προὔμαθον with 536–8n., *Aj.* 163 γνῶμας προδιδάσκειν.

1016–17 ἐμ'... τῆσδ': ἐμ' gains emphasis by its position near the beginning of the sentence and separation from the two verbs that govern it, συνδήσας and ἄγειν. Od. has said nothing about 'binding' Phil., but Phil. anticipates that the two men holding him will do so, before bringing him from Lemnos to Troy by force (cf. 988 μ'... ἀπάξεται βίαι). For τῆσδ' at position 6, in agreement with ἀκτῆς at position 5 and followed by a strong sense break that rhetorically bisects the line, see 1009n.

1018 ἄφιλον... νεκρόν: a forceful conclusion to the first part of Phil.'s speech, with two resolutions and a characteristically Sophoklean juxtaposition of words with opposite meanings (see *Introd.*, p. 35). For ἄφιλον... ἀπολιν, cf. 227–8 with 227–9n., 269. Phil.'s virtual or symbolic death on Lemnos, a fundamental theme of the play (311n., *Introd.*, p. 16), is particularly prominent in this episode, cf. 946–7 with 946n., 1030.

1019 καίτοι... ἡδῆμην 'and yet I have often wished for this'. Phil. corrects himself or at least objects to what he has just said. If καί σοι were read, Phil. would not be correcting himself but expressing the impotence of his curse.

1020 ἀλλ'... γάρ: each particle fulfils its own normal function independently: 'but - for the gods allot nothing sweet to me - you enjoy being alive, but I am in pain...' Cf. 81 with 81-2n. Contrast ἀλλὰ... γάρ in combination 'marking the contrast between what is irrelevant or subsidiary and what is vital, primary, or decisive' (GP 101), e.g. *El.* 222-4 οὐ λάθει μ' ὄργα. | ἀλλ' ἐν γάρ δεινοῖς οὐ σχήσω | ταύτας ἄτας. θεοί: for the synizesis cf. 196n.

1021-2 ἀλγύνομαι... τάλας 'I am in pain in this very respect, that I live, wretch (that I am), in the company of many evils'. τοῦτ' αὐθ' is acc. of respect expressing the cause, which is further defined by ὅτι ζῶ... Cf. *OT* 1005-6 μάλιστα τοῦτ' ἀφικόμεν, ὅπως |... εὐ πράξαιμι τι. For the acc., especially of neuter adjectives and pronouns, after verbs of feeling or emotion, cf. *Aj.* 650 τὰ δέιν' ἐκαρτέρουν, *Tr.* 1046-7 ὦ πολλά δὴ καὶ θερμὰ κοῦ λόγῳ κακὰ |... μοχθήσας ἐγώ. Cf. Moorhouse 36, Smyth §1595a.

1023-4 γελώμενος... στρατηγῶν: characters in Attic tragedy typically detest the prospect of being mocked or laughed at by their enemies, e.g. 257-8, *Aj.* 303, 367, *Ant.* 483, 647; cf. *Eur. Med.* 383, 404, 797. Conversely, they welcome the prospect of laughing at their enemies, cf. *Aj.* 79. Phil.'s way of referring to the 'two sons of Atreus', without actually naming them, is mocking and disrespectful, cf. 264. οἷς... ὑπηρετεῖς: Od. had claimed to be serving Zeus (989-90), but Phil. considers him an ignoble lackey of the sons of Atreus, 'whom you serve in these matters'. Phil.'s comment could be understood as sarcastic, implying that Od.'s claim to be merely following orders is false; cf. 1028 ὡς σὺ φῆς...

1025-8 καίτοι... ἐβαλον: Phil. contrasts Od. (σύ) as agent with himself (ἐμέ) as victim, and ἐμέ gains emphasis from resolution of the heavy syllable at position 6 in 1026. κλοπῇ τε κἀνάγκῃ probably refers to the story, told in the *Kypria* and dramatized in Soph.'s lost *Odysseus Mainomenos*, that Odysseus tried to avoid going to Troy by pretending to be mad, but was forced to join the expedition when his ruse was exposed by Palamedes; cf. 72-3 with n. The yoking metaphor may allude specifically to the story, known from *Hyg. Fab.* 95 but possibly as old as the *Kypria*, that Od. feigned madness by yoking a horse and an ox to his plough, and that Palamedes induced him to stop by placing the infant Telemachos in the path of the plough (or, according to Apollod. *Epit.* 3.7, by threatening to kill Telemachos with a sword). See Pearson 1917: π.115-16 and Frazer π.176-7n.2 for other sources and versions of the story. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 841-2 'Odysseus alone, who sailed against his will, | was a ready trace-horse (i.e. 'helper'), once he was yoked'. ἐπτά ναοί: cf. *Il.* 2.718-19 τῶν δὲ Φιλοκτήτης ἤρχεν... | ἐπτά νεῶν. ναοί is dat. denoting 'accompanying' circumstances (Smyth §1527, Moorhouse 90-1). ἄτιμον ἐβαλον: an Athenian audience would probably have associated ἄτιμον with ἀτιμία, the legal term for 'deprivation of civic rights and privileges'. The simple verb, ἐβαλον 'cast out', is used for the compound, ἐξέβαλον but, especially after ἄτιμον, also suggests προὔβαλον, another legal term meaning to 'present an accusation of (a person's) guilt' before the Athenian assembly.

1029–34 Phil.'s sarcasm and anger are marked by the repeated interrogatives (τί... τί... τοῦ, πῶς... πῶς...) and the resolutions in 1033 and 1034.

1029 καί... χάριν: καί νῦν intensifies the three questions, τί... τί... τοῦ... ἄγετε implies the use of physical force (cf. 985), and ἀπάγεσθε (mid.) suggests Od.'s and Ne.'s interest in compelling Phil. to go to Troy (cf. 613, 988). Phil.'s ἀπάγεσθε resonates too with the use of ἀπάγω/-ομαι in classical Athens as a technical term for arresting someone or bringing him physically to a courtroom, prison, or execution (LSJ s.v. iv).

1030 τέθνηχ' ὑμῖν: cf. 311n., 1018 with n. ὑμῖν is dat. of reference (cf. *Aj.* 970 θεοῖς τέθνηκεν οὗτος, 1128 τῷιδε... οἴχομαι, *Tr.* 1071 πολλοῖσιν οἰκτρόν, Smyth §1496), but there is also a suggestion of agency: both 'I've died (and am dead) as far as you are concerned' and 'I've died at your hands'.

1032 δυσώδης: cf. 876, 890–1, the only references earlier in the play to Phil.'s foul smell, both spoken by Phil. himself. Od. does not mention the stench at 8–11, when he tells Ne. why he marooned Phil. ten years earlier, but it was part of the traditional story. Cf. *Kypria, Arg.* (Bernabé 43 = West 2003 76–7): 'Philoktetes, having been struck by a water-snake, was left behind on Lemnos on account of his foul smell (διὰ τὴν δυσσομίαν)'; Soph. fr. 697 (from *Philoktetes in Troy*) 'only do not be burdened by my smell' (ὄσμη).

1032–3 πῶς... ἔτι 'how is it possible, when once I have set sail (with you), to burn offerings to the gods? How (is it possible) still to pour libations'? Pierson corrected εὔξασθ', the reading of the MSS, to ἔξεστ', on the basis of Σ 8τι θῦσαι οὐκ ἔστι. ἔξεστ' (present tense) is appropriate, because Phil. is echoing the statements of the Greek commanders at the time they abandoned him.

1035–44 Phil., after again cursing Od. to destruction (1035), expresses a sense of justice and cosmic order 'which is far from being the true one' (Reinhardt 1979: 186, cf. Pucci 279). He says, correctly, that Od. would never have come for him, if not for a 'divine goad' (1037–9), but he wrongly assumes, despite his comment at 451–2 (cf. Poole 1987: 204), that this must mean the gods are concerned with justice (1036–7), when all it demonstrates is that, as Helenos' prophecy said, the Greeks need him to win the war. In some sense the prophecy reflects a divine order that could well be called δίκη, in the original sense of the word, 'the way things are'. Phil., however, asserts a cosmic order that is not merely 'the way things are', but is ethically 'just', and he calls on the gods, if they pity him, to 'pay back all of them together' (sc. Od., Ne., and the Greek army). For Phil., this reciprocal harm, in return for the harm they have done to him, would be ethically meaningful, and audiences familiar with passages in Homer and Hesiod (e.g. *Od.* 18.140–50, *WD* 248–73) that implied at least a hope that there was such a thing as divine justice, might agree. Such payback does not actually happen in the course of the play: there is no indication that the gods are at all concerned with the kind of retributive 'justice' that Phil. calls for and that would bring him satisfaction. In the end, though they 'save' Phil. from his suffering, they neither make that suffering ethically meaningful nor

grant him the ‘justice’ he believes (1035–44) must be coming to him (cf. Pucci 279–81).

1035 ὄλοισθ’ . . . ὀλεῖσθε: Phil. had cursed Od. alone in 1019, but here the plur. includes Agamemnon and Menelaos (cf. 1028), Ne. and the Chorus, and presumably the whole Greek army (cf. 1042, 1285–6). The repetition of the same verb, first in the opt., then in the fut. indic., reflects Phil.’s certainty that his enemies actually will perish.

1036 τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε: i.e. Phil. himself. Cf. 1375 φίλου μετ’ ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, *Tr.* 305 τῇσδε γε ζώσης ἔτι, Aesch. *Ag.* 1438 γυναικὸς τῇσδε. This use of ὅδε for ἐγὼ in poetry, especially tragedy, is an extension of its general use to denote what is present and can be seen and pointed to. (cf. LSJ *s.v.* ὅδε 1.1). θεοῖσιν . . . μέλει ‘if the gods are concerned with justice’. θεοῖσιν is disyllabic (–υ), with synizesis of ε and οί, cf. 1020. Of twenty-five occurrences in Soph. of synizesis in a form of θεός (cf. 195–6n.), this is the only one that follows a light syllable (Diggle 136n.124), but that is no reason to suspect the text.

1037 ἔξοιδα . . . μέλει γ’ ‘and I know that they *do* care’. μέλει γ’ is highly emphatic, because of the combination of γ’ with a strong sense-break at position 6 and no word-end at position 5 or 7; see 1009n. When γε follows δέ, it generally is emphatic (like δῆ) rather than limitative. Cf. 660, 1293, *GP* 151–3.

1037–9 ἐπεὶ . . . ἐμοῦ ‘for you never would have sailed on this voyage on account of a wretched man, if some divine desire (lit. ‘goad’) for me had not brought you’ – a contrary-to-fact condition, since they have indeed ‘sailed on this voyage’. Phil. takes the very presence of Od. and Ne. on Lemnos as a sign that the gods are indeed ‘concerned with justice’ (1036). For repeated ἄν, cf. 222–3 with n., 947–8 with n. κέντρον governs ἐμοῦ as obj. gen., on the model of words denoting sexual desire (ἐρώω, ποθέω, etc.), with which κέντρον is often figuratively associated: e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 39 κέντροις ἐρωτος, Plato *Rep.* 573a9 πόθου κέντρον (LSJ *s.v.* κέντρον 1.b). ἐπεὶ οὐποτ’: for synizesis of -ει and ου-, cf. 446, 948.

1040 ὦ . . . ἐπόψιοι ‘O land of my fathers and watchful gods’, cf. *El.* 67 ὦ πατρῴα γῆ θεοὶ τ’ ἐγχώριοι. Phil. addresses both the θεοὶ ἐγχώριοι who watch over Malis and Mt Oita (Zeus, Herakles) and, more generally, the gods who watch over human life and punish injustice, including, presumably, the Furies and Zeus. Cf. *Aj.* 835–6 τὰς αἰεὶ τε παρθένους | αἰεὶ θ’ ὀρώσας πάντα τὰν βροτοῖς πάθη, *El.* 175 Ζεύς, ὃς ἐφορᾷ πάντα καὶ κρατύνει.

1041 ἀλλὰ . . . ποτέ ‘at least after a long time’, ‘at long last’, cf. *Tr.* 201 ἀλλὰ σὺν χρόνῳ, *El.* 1013 ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ ποτέ, Eur. *Med.* 912 ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ. In these elliptical expressions, ἀλλὰ responds to an understood ‘if not at first’, ‘if not previously’. Cf. *GP* 13, LSJ *s.v.* ἀλλὰ 1.2.b, Mastronarde on Eur. *Med.* 912.

1042 εἴ τι . . . οἰκτῖρετε: καὶ goes both with ἐμέ, with which it is combined in crasis, and with εἴ . . . οἰκτῖρετε, i.e. both ‘if in any respect you actually pity me’ and ‘if in any respect you pity me too (as well as others who have been wronged)’. Cf. *Ant.* 280 παῦσαι πρὶν ὀργῆς κάμει μεστῶσαι λέγων, *GP* 303–4. The indic.

mood with εἰ suggests that Phil. believes the gods really do pity him. Cf. 1075 with 1074-5n.

1043-4 εἰ... πεφευγῆναι: Phil. ends his speech with a future-less-vivid condition that will never be satisfied: Phil. *will* escape his disease, when he is healed at Troy (cf. 1329-34, 1424, 1437-8), but he will never see his enemies destroyed. For the overall structure and sense of the condition, cf. *Il.* 6.284-5 εἰ κείνόν γε ἴδομι κατελθόντ' Αἴδος εἶσω, | φαίην κε φρέν' ἀτέρπου δίζυος ἐκλελαθέσθαι 'if I should see that man gone down into (the house of) Hades, I would think my mind had forgotten its joyless misery'. τῆς νόσου is the so-called 'ablative' gen., signifying cessation, release, escape from, etc. (Smyth §1392, K-G 1.395). Cf. *Od.* 1.18 πεφυγμένος ἦεν ἀέθλων. Usually φεύγω takes the acc. of the person or thing being fled or is accompanied by ἐκ + gen.

1045-6 βαρὺς τε... κακοῖς 'the stranger is distressful and has spoken a speech that is distressful and does not yield to (the burden of) evils' – a choral comment of a kind frequently found in tragedy between speeches paired in a formal debate (ἀγών). Cf. *Ant.* 471-2, 681-2, *OC* 1346-7. Here, however, Od. declines to take part in the debate: he does not make a full reply to Phil.'s speech, but instead offers a brief statement of his way of life (1047-62). This probably would have surprised an audience schooled by theatrical experience to expect a defence more or less equal in length to Phil.'s accusation. ξένος is distant and harsh. Cf. Phil.'s use of the word in 923, with 923-4n.

1046 κοῦχ... κακοῖς: Sophoklean characters are often seen or are said not to 'yield' (εἴκω, ὑπείκω, εἰκάθω); cf. 1352, *Ant.* 472 εἵκειν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται κακοῖς, *El.* 359-61 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἂν ποτ... τούτοις ὑπείκαθόμην, with Perrotta 1935: 457-8n.1, Knox 1964: 15-17.

1047-53 Od. neither responds in detail to Phil.'s impassioned speech nor defends his own actions. He says nothing about how he has treated Phil., but sets forth his own opportunistic way of being in the world and highest personal value – victory on any and every occasion, regardless of conventional moral considerations (cf. 81). In the Prologue, where Od. seduces Ne. with the argument that the 'possession of victory is something sweet to get', even if one gets it by acting shamelessly (81, 83-4, cf. 120), 'victory' means gaining control of Phil.'s bow and in that way winning the war; this is the triumph he calls on 'Victory Athena, the City Goddess' to help them achieve (134). Here, however, Od. says that his personal victory *tout court* overrides all other considerations and justifies whatever must be done in any situation (1049, cf. Blundell 1989: 188, Pucci 281-2).

1047-8 πολλ'... λόγου 'I would have many things to say in response to this man's words, if it should be feasible for me (to speak at some other time), but now, as it is, I have power over a single speech (i.e. "I can say just one thing")'. Od. begins in standard oratorical style, with πολλά as rhetorical foil for what follows in the clause beginning νῦν δέ..., but this conventional opening is at odds with the idiosyncratic quality of what he actually says. εἰ μοι παρῆκοι implies that Od. does not have time for a long speech, only for 'one word'. κρατῶ suggests that

for Od. the real issue is one of power: it is not feasible for him to try to refute what Phil. has said, so he will not try. (Contrast *OT* 409 τοῦδε γὰρ κἀγὼ κρατῶ, where Teiresias, by saying, ‘Even I have power over this’, means that he can (and is right to) respond to Oidipous’ accusations.) Od. might be preparing to call Phil.’s bluff by threatening to take the bow and leave Phil. behind on Lemnos, in the attempt to shock him into agreeing to come to Troy; so there may be a strong tactical element in Od.’s words. It is impossible to know for certain, but the scene could be played in a tone suggestive of bluffing (as a last desperate effort to get Phil. to cooperate). Cf. 1054–62n.

1049–53 οὐ... ἐκστήσομαι: the clearest expression in the play of Od.’s amoral relativism (cf. *Introd.*, pp. 22–3) and inborn (ἐφνυ) ‘desire to win everywhere’ is followed by the surprising qualification – more surprising, perhaps, to Phil. than to the audience – ‘except with regard to you. Now, for you, I shall willingly stand aside’.

1049 οὐ... ἐγὼ ‘for where there’s a need for such men, such a man am I’. Cf. 915, 1326, 1337 where γάρ introduces a similarly striking statement that requires clarification (*GP* 59). τοιοῦτος implies that Od. opportunistically adapts himself to any situation, saying and doing whatever will bring him victory at any given moment. This adaptability is part of what Phil. has in mind at 407–8, when he says that Od. ‘would apply his tongue to every evil speech and (every) villainy’ (cf. 96–9n., 407–8n., 633–4; see too 927–8, where Phil. describes Ne. under Od.’s influence as similarly ready to do anything and everything).

1050–1 χάπουν... εὐσέβῃ: cf. 83–5, especially the notion that Ne. can act shamelessly today to gain victory ‘and then for the rest of time... be called the most pious of all mortals’. Here, however, Od.’s claim that when the occasion demands, ‘you would find no one more pious than I’, immediately following his declaration of amoral relativism, shows even more clearly than his comment in 85 that he does not consider εὐσέβεια to be a moral quality. Rather, it is a matter of how one performs, is seen to perform, and is spoken of, and whether one gets things done, when one is competing to be judged ‘good’ and ‘just’. This conception contrasts strongly with the authoritative comment by Herakles to Phil. and Ne. (1441–4) that in comparison with ‘being pious (εὐσεβεῖν) in matters that have to do with the the gods’, Zeus considers all else ‘secondary’; that ‘piety’ has its own, objective existence and ‘does not die with mortals: whether they live or die, it does not perish’.

1052 ἐφνυ: by using ἐφνυ neutrally and amorally to describe his own inborn desire for victory anywhere and everywhere, Od. implicitly calls into question the ethical significance of φύσις for Ne., Phil., and the play’s viewers and readers.

1053 πλὴν... ἐκστήσομαι: πλὴν εἰς σέ (cf. *Ant.* 731 εἰς τοὺς κακοὺς) is abrupt and surprising, after Od.’s statement of his need for victory everywhere. The repetition σέ... σοί is pointed and emphatic.

1054–62 Od. concludes by ordering the two men who have been holding Phil. since 1003 to release him, since he is not needed. Then he cruelly

mocks Phil. by telling him to 'enjoy strolling on Lemnos', while the bow gives Teukros or Od. himself the honour and glory that should have been Phil.'s. It is impossible to know whether Od. really intends to take the bow and leave Phil. behind, despite the terms of Helenos' prophecy (cf. 612-13, Webster on 1055, Winnington-Ingram 1980: 293). This impossibility of knowing is part of the play's pervasive uncertainty and ambiguity concerning its mythological background and its characters' motivations and intentions.

1054-6 ἄφετε... ταῦτ' 'yes, release him, and don't touch (him) further from now on. | Let (him) stay. And we don't need *you* further, | since we have these weapons'. γάρ 'confirms ἐκστήσομαι' (Jebb, cf. *GP* 61), and προσχρήζομεν echoes προσψάσῃτ' ('further... further...'). For ἔτι 'henceforth', 'in the future', 'from now on', cf. 1188, 1217, *LSJ s.v.* 1.3. The monosyllable at position 6, following the caesura and before a strong sense-break, is emphatic, cf. 1009n.

1056-9 ἐπεὶ... χερί 'for, on the one hand, Teukros is with us, having this knowledge (*sc.* of how to use the bow) and I, who think I would control it in no respect worse than you and aim it with (my) hand (in no way worse than you)'. For the asymmetrical construction and slight anacolouthon in corresponding μέν and τε clauses, cf. 1136-7, 1424-5, *Tr.* 1012 πολλά μέν ἐν πόντῳ, κατὰ τε δρία πάντα καθαίρων. Cf. *GP* 374-6 with 374-5n.2.

οἶμαι introduces an indirect discourse construction, in which ἄν goes with both κρατύνειν and ἐπιθύνειν, the latter an epic-Ionic word found only here in tragedy. κάκιον modifies the two infinitives and governs τούτων as gen. of comparison. μή is often used in indirect discourse after verbs of strong or confident assertion, where οὐ might be expected. Cf. Smyth §2725, *GMT* §685, K-G II.193-4.

1060 χαῖρε... πατῶν: Phil., of course can hardly 'walk', at all (cf. 290-2, 294), let alone 'stroll'. The def. article is scornful and belittling ('that Lemnos of yours'), cf. 381, 813, *Ant.* 324 κόμψενέ νυν τὴν δόξαν.

1061-2 καὶ... ἔχειν lit. 'and perhaps your special prize would dispense to me the honour that should have been yours'. χρεῖν, ἔδει, ὦφελον, etc. are used with a complementary inf. in a potential construction (virtually the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition), when the action of the inf. is denied, i.e. when the necessity, duty, or possibility is *not* fulfilled. If Phil. were in possession of the bow, he would rightly have the honour (but he is not in possession of it). Cf. *GMT* §§415-19, Smyth §§1774-9, K-G 1.204-5.

γέρας... τιμὴν: in Homer, γέρας can denote a special prize or award given to honour an individual's heroic achievements over and above the plunder shared in by all warriors (cf. *Il.* 1.118, 123, 9.367); any kind of a gift or privilege that acknowledges or confers honour or worth, such as a special cut of meat (*Od.* 4.66, cf. *Il.* 7.321 νώτοισιν δ' Αἴαντα διηνεκέσσι γέραιεν); a special privilege given to those belonging to certain groups, e.g. the right of old men to advise and speak to younger warriors (*Il.* 4.323, 9.422) and the right of the dead to burial and lamentation (*Il.* 16.457 = 675, 23.9, *Od.* 24.190, 296). Phil.'s bow is a γέρας, because he received it as a special

reward for the exceptional heroic deed of lighting Herakles' pyre (cf. 670, 801–3); it can be said to 'dispense . . . honour' both because it reflects Herakles' glory onto Phil. and, more importantly, because it is the instrument with which Troy will be taken, and the one who wields it will win the highest honour in the Greek army (cf. 115, 117, 1344–7, 1426–9, 1439–40). Od. torments Phil. by telling him that he himself will garner the reward that should be Phil.'s, if only he were willing to use the bow against the Trojans. σὲ χρῆν: this emendation of σ' ἐχρῆν, the reading of most MSS, is not strictly necessary but likely to be correct: both χρῆν and augmented ἐχρῆν were correct forms of the third-person imperf. indic. act. of χρῆ, but elsewhere Soph. uses only χρῆν (430, 1363, *Tr.* 1133, *OT* 1184, 1185, *El.* 529, 579, 1505). ἐχρῆν occurs in one fragment of an *Aleites*, which used to be attributed to Soph. (fr. 103.6N² = fr. 107.6P), but is now considered of unknown authorship (*TrGF* fr. *adesp.* 1b [g].20).

1063–4 οἶμοι . . . φανῆ: Phil. is stunned by Od.'s threat and unable to respond. His anguish and incredulity at the possibility that Od. 'will appear among the Argives, adorned with my weapons', are expressed in a rhetorical question that gains force from (1) the juxtaposition of σὺ and ἐμοῖς ('you with my weapons?'); (2) the enjambment by which ἐμοῖς, the final word in the line, agreeing with ὀπλοισι at the beginning of the next line, is made even more emphatic; and (3) the virtual middle caesura in 1064, where ἐν at the caesural position 7 is closely linked with the following word, Ἀργείοις, and κοσμηθεῖς at position 6 bisects the line, giving it an awkward rhythm that expresses Phil.'s struggle to come to terms with what he has just heard (cf. 101, 1369). At 944 Phil. had envisioned Ne. appearing among the Argives with his weapons, but the prospect of his worst enemy, Od., doing so is far more painful. For κοσμέω used of warriors 'adorned' with armour, cf. Eur. *Pho.* 1244 φίλοι δ' ἐκόσμου with Mastronarde's note.

1065 μὴ μ' . . . δῆ 'don't say anything to me, as (I am) already walking (away)'. στείχοντα agrees with μ', and ὥς, as often with participles of cause, purpose, etc., denotes the speaker's thought and intention (cf. Smyth §2086). For double acc. with ἀντιφώνει, modelled on the Homeric construction with ἀμειβομαι, λέγω, προσφημί, etc., cf. *OC* 991 ἐν γὰρ μ' ἀμειψαι μῶνον. The double acc. of person and thing is found mainly with verbs of asking, requesting, ordering, concealing, and taking away; cf. 376, 915, Smyth §§1628–9, Moorhouse 41. δῆ at the end of the final line of Od.'s speech marks his going (ὥς στείχοντα) as climactic and decisive, and leads Phil. to turn to Ne. in the following lines. δῆ is neither ironic nor merely temporal (= ἤδη). See *GP* 203–4, 214–15, 230.

1066–7 ὦ . . . ἄπει: Phil. addresses Ne., who is beginning to depart with Od. The scene could be played with Phil. recognizing in Ne., and appealing to, a hesitation and uncertainty as to what he (Ne.) should do. Or there could be no visible hesitation on Ne.'s part, and Phil. could be appealing to him in light of the solidarity they established earlier in the play (671–5). By calling Ne. 'seed of

Achilles', Phil. in effect challenges him to live up to his φύσις (and reminds the audience or reader that he is not doing so). οὐδὲ . . . προσφθεγκτός 'will

I not even be addressed by your voice any more'? Cf. 225–9. Phil.'s question, full of pathos, calls attention to Ne.'s silence since 974. Cf. *OC* 1279 οὕτως ἀφῆι με μηδὲν ἀντειπὼν ἔπος. φωνῆς . . . προσφθεγκτός: for the gen., cf. 867–8n. 1068–9.

1068–9 χάρει . . . διαφθερεῖς: Ne. stops walking or slows his pace, looking back at Phil. and preparing to answer his question. This prompts Od. to intervene and speak before Ne. can do so. Od. hurries him on, mocking the nobility that would naturally lead Ne. to pity Phil. and warning him against doing anything to 'destroy our good fortune'. μὴ πρόσλευσσε . . . ὦν 'don't keep looking (at him), although being noble (and therefore tending to pity him)'. The pres. imper. suggests that Ne., as he is walking away, does not take his eyes off Phil. γενναῖός περ ὦν goes more closely with μὴ πρόσλευσσε than with the ὅπως clause in the following line ('so you will not, although being noble, destroy our good fortune'), though it is felt with both clauses. Od. is not so much mocking as appealing to Ne.: 'I know your instinct is against treating Phil. like this, but you've got to go through with it'. Cf. 79–83. Because μὴ πρόσλευσσε is the functional equivalent of a verb of 'taking care', ὅπως μὴ . . . is used with the fut. indic. rather than with the subjunct., in a purpose clause.

1070–1 ἦ . . . λειφθήσομαι 'will I actually be left (behind) by you, thus desolate?' Wakefield's emendation rightly restores pointedly emphatic δῆ in place of weak ἤδη ('now'), the reading of the MSS. For πρὸς with the gen. of personal agency, used often, but not exclusively, when an action is to follow immediately, cf. 384, 1023, 1359, Moorhouse 123–4, K–G 1.127–8.

1072 ναυκράτωρ: ναυκρατέω usually means 'have mastery of the sea', but here the noun clearly signifies 'ship's captain'. Perhaps members of the Athenian audience who rowed in the fleet would have identified with this deference by the Chorus to their commander. Cf. 135–43.

1074–80 Ne. speaks to the Chorus, not to Phil., though Phil. too (and Od.) are meant to hear what he says. He allows them to remain with Phil. temporarily, in the hope that they may change his attitude. As Od. and Ne. depart, Ne. associates himself even more closely with Od.'s treatment of Phil. by the use of 'we' (1077, 1079, 1080), especially the dual at 1079.

1074–5 ἀκούσομαι . . . τοῦδ' 'I shall hear about myself from this one that I am (too) full of pity'. τοῦδ' refers to Od. and suggests a deictic gesture by Ne. in his direction. For ἀκούσομαι 'I shall hear about myself', 'I shall have it said of me', cf. the active forms of ἀκούω at 378, 382, 607, all involving insults or bad things said about the one 'hearing'. πλέως is often used reproachfully, e.g. *El.* 607 ἀναιδείας πλέαν, *Eur. Med.* 263 φόβου πλέα. μέιναι: the aor. rather than pres. imper. implies that the Chorus' remaining with Phil. is 'momentary', because they will soon be leaving, as is clear from the following clause (τοσοῦτον . . . εὐξώμεθα); cf. K–G 1.191. εἰ . . . δοκεῖ: εἰ + indic.,

as often, is more ‘since (as is the case)’ than ‘if (as is possible or probable)’; cf. 1042 with n. τοῦδε refers to Od., τοῦτωι to Phil.; τοῦδε is accompanied by a deictic gesture, τοῦτωι (somewhat disrespectful in Phil.’s presence) by no more than a glance.

1076–7 χρόνον . . . εὐζώμεθα ‘for so much time until the sailors prepare the things in the ship and we pray to the gods’. τὰ τ’ ἐκ νεώς: Ne. speaks of ‘the things in the ship’ from the viewpoint of one who sees, in his mind’s eye, ‘the things’ at a location distant from himself, as if the sight were reflected back to him from its distant location: thus ‘the things’ are ‘out of’ or ‘away from’ the ship. In this use of ἐκ, the speaker’s viewpoint is decisive. Cf. *Ant.* 411 καθήμεθ’ ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπὴνέμοι, where the Guard visualizes the group of guards sitting at a distance and downwind from the high rocks on which Polyneices’ corpse is lying, in order to avoid the stench of the body. Cf. Griffith *ad loc.*, Moorhouse 108–9. For other explanations of this difficult construction, see Jebb *ad loc.*, K–G 1.544–5, Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 1009 στὰς ἐξ ἐπάλξεων ἄκρων.

1078–9 χοῦτος . . . ἡμῖν ‘and perhaps, in this (period of time), this man may acquire some way of thinking more agreeable to us’. ἡμῖν is dat. of advantage, dependent on λώϊω, the acc. sing. of λωῖων (Attic λώϊων) ‘better’. λωῖων is used mainly in the sense of ‘more agreeable, more favourable’, but in tragedy can serve more generally as a comparative of ἀγαθός. Cf. LSJ *s.v.* λωῖων 1, Chantraine, *DELG s.v.* φρόνησις: cf. 1006 μηδὲν ὑγιὲς μηδ’ ἐλεύθερον φρονῶν, 1099 φρονῆσαι, 1259 ἔσωφρονήσας: κἄν τὰ λοιφ’ οὕτω φρονῆις . . ., all of which refer to a particular character’s attitude or way of thinking. ἐν τούτωι = ἐν τούτωι τῷ χρόνῳ, referring back to 1076–7 χρόνον.

1079 νῶ . . . ὁρμώμεθον: the dual expresses Ne.’s solidarity with Od. by putting them both on a naturally equal footing despite Ne.’s earlier use of the dual to pair himself and Phil. (779), his protestation of friendship with Phil. (671–3), and Phil.’s appeal at 1066–7. On the strategic use of the dual by various characters and the Chorus, cf. 25n., 533n., 539–41n., 627n. Her.’s use of the dual at 1436, with reference to the two lions to which he compares Ne. and Phil., suggests that in the end Phil. wins the contest with Od. to determine who is truly Ne.’s peer and comrade.

1080 ὁρμᾶσθαι ταχεῖς ‘come quick’, cf. 526 ὁρμᾶσθω ταχύς with n. For epicizing inf. for imper., cf. 57, 1411.

1081–1217: SECOND KOMMOS, IN PLACE OF A STASIMON

After Od. and Ne. have departed for the ship, Phil. and the Chorus, in dialogue, sing two strophes and antistrophes (1080–1100/1101–22; 1123–45/1146–68), which are followed by a lively, astrophic *amoihaion* (1179–1217) much longer than a typical epode. Sophoklean characters, both male and female, frequently sing in exchanges with the Chorus or other characters, when they are ‘in physical pain

or extreme emotional turmoil' (Hall 2006: 309): cf. *Aj.* 348–429, *Ant.* 781–882, *Tr.* 1004–1043, *OT* 1313–66, *El.* 121–250, 1232–87, *OC* 510–48. Here, Phil. begins each strophe and antistrophe by reiterating, in a lyric register, his feelings of hopeless abandonment and anger (cf. 927–62, 1004–44). The Chorus, though, are for the most part unresponsive, and the *kommos* as a whole is notable for the almost complete lack of communication between themselves and Phil. (Pucci 284, Kitzinger 2008: 126–7). Phil.'s intransigence in the face of his suffering is incomprehensible to the Chorus, and they cannot persuade him to accompany them to Troy. They pity him but nevertheless blame him for his suffering, despite the instrumental and inhumane way in which Od., Ne., and they themselves have treated him for their own advantage. The Chorus appeal to Phil. in the name of 'friendship' (1121–2), but this 'friendship' turns out to include a justification of how Ne. (or Od., cf. 1143–5n.) victimized Phil. while 'accomplishing a public benefit for his friends' (1143–5). As far as Phil. is concerned, his only real 'friend' is the bow (1128 ὦ τόξον φίλον); by contrast, he refers to the Chorus, and they refer to themselves, merely as ξένοι (1163, 1184, 1190, 1203). The Chorus' 'combination of weak pity and strong self-interest' (Winnington-Ingram 1980: 294), evident throughout the *kommos*, keeps them from genuine sympathy with Phil.'s suffering and despair. After the *kommos* they retreat into a cruel silence, which they maintain for the next 250 lines, until the play's closing anapaests.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe α

	— — — — — ^b	
1081	ὦ κοίλας πέτρας γύαλον	chor dim B
1101	ὦ τλάμων τλάμων ἄρ' ἐγὼ	
	— — — — —	
1082	θερμὸν [τε] καὶ παγετώδες, ὥς	glyc
1102	καὶ μόχθῳ λαβατὸς, ὃς ἦ-	
	— — — — — ^b	
1083	σ' οὐκ ἔμελλον ἄρ', ὦ τάλας	glyc
1103	δη μετ' οὐδενὸς ὕστερον	
	— — — — —	
1084	λείπειν οὐδέποτε', ἀλλὰ μοι	glyc
1104	ἀνδρῶν εἰσοπίσω τάλας	
	— — — — — ^{h, c}	
1085	καὶ θνήσκοντι συνείσηι.	pher
1105	ναίων ἐνθάδ' ὀλοῦμαι,	
	— — — — —	
1086	ὦ μοι μοί μοι.	extra metrum
1106	αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,	

1087	— — — — — — — — ^b ὦ πληρέστατον αὐλίον	glyc
1107	οὐ φορβάν ἔτι προσφέρων,	
1088	— — — — — — — — λύπας τᾶς ὅπ' ἐμοῦ τάλαν,	glyc
1108	οὐ πτανῶν ἅπ' ἐμῶν ὀπλων	
1089	— — — — — — — — ^c τίπτ' αὖ μοι τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ ἔσται;	hipp
1110	κραταιαῖς μετὰ χερσίν ἴσχων·	
1090	— — — — — — — — ^b τοῦ ποτε τεύξομαι;	dodrans A
1111	ἀλλά μοι ἄσκοπα	
1091	— — — — — — — — σιτονόμου μέλεος πόθεν ἐλπίδος;	dactyl tetram
1112	κρυπτά τ' ἔπη δολερᾶς ὑπέδου φρενός·	
1092	— — — — — — — — ^b ἴθ' αἰ πρόσθ' ἄνω	dochm
1113	ἰδοίμαν δέ νιν,	
1093	— — — — — — — — πτωκάδες ὀξύτόνου διὰ πνεύματος	dactyl tetram
1114	τὸν τάδε μισάμενον, τὸν ἴσον χρόνον	
1094	— — — — — — — — ^c ἄλωσιν οὐκέτ' ἴσχω.	iamb dim cat
1115	ἐμὰς λαχόντ' ἀνίας.	
1095	— — — — — — — — σύ τοι, σύ τοι κατηξιω-	iamb dim
1116	πότμος, <πότμος> σε δαιμόνων	
1096	— — — — — — — — ^b σας, ὦ βαρύποτμε, κούκ	dochm (?)
1117	τάδ', οὐδέ σέ γε δόλος	
1097	— — — — — — — — ἄλλοθεν ἅ τυχὰ ἄδ' ἀπὸ μείζονος·	dactyl tetram
1118	ἔσχ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἐμᾶς· στυγεράν ἔχε	
1098	— — — — — — — — ^c εὐτέ γε παρὸν φρονῆσαι	iamb dim cat
1120	δύσποτμον ἄρὰν ἐπ' ἄλλοις.	
1099	— — — — — — — — λώιονος δαίμονος εἰ-	chor dim
1121	καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοῦτο μέλει	
1100	— — — — — — — — λου τὸ κακίον αἰνεῖν.	aristoph
1122	μὴ φιλότῃτ' ἀπώσῃ.	

The metre of strophe and antistrophe α is aeolo-choriambic (Introd., p. 41), like that of strophe and antistrophe β (1123-68), of the first and third strophic pairs in the *parodos*, and of the stasimon at 676-729. In each stanza the first part (1081-94/1101-15) is sung by Phil. and the second part (1095-1100, 1116-22) by the Chorus. Metrically, however, the parts of the stanzas have a different organization: 1081-9/1101-10 are exclusively aeolic; 1090-1100/1111-22 begin with an aeolic colon, *dodrans* A (1090/1111), then modulate into a combination of dactylic tetrameter and various iambic cola, before closing with an aeolic *aristophaneum* (1100/1122). This mixture of different families of metre is typical of Soph.'s later plays, as is the sequence of dactylic tetrameter followed by a colon beginning with a light syllable (1091-2/1112-13, 1093-4/1114-15; cf. 142-3/157-8, 1133 4/1156 7; cf. the metrical analysis of strophe and antistrophe α of the *parodos*). There is 'epic correpion' in 1097 ἀ τύχα ἔδ, 1111 ἀλλά μοι ἄσσοκπα.

Metre: strophe and antistrophe β

1123	οἶμοι μοι καὶ που πολιάς	chor dim B
1146	ὦ πταναὶ θῆραι χαροπῶν τ'	
1124	πόντου θινὸς ἐφήμενος	glyc / chor dim B
1147	ἔθνη θηρῶν, οὓς ὁδ' ἔχει	
1125	γελαῖ μιν, χερὶ πάλλων	pher
1148	χῶρος οὐρεσιβώτας,	
1126	τάν ἐμάν μελέου τροφάν,	glyc
1149	φυγαὶ μηκέτ' ἀπ' αὐλίων	
1127	τάν οὐδεὶς ποτ' ἐβάστασεν	glyc
1150	ἔλατ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔχω χεροῖν	
1128	ὦ τόξον φίλον, ὦ φίλων	glyc
1151	τάν πρόσθεν βελέων ὀλκάν,	
1129	χειρῶν ἐκβεβιασμένον,	glyc
1152	ὦ δύστανος ἐγὼ τανῦν	
1130	ἦ που ἔλεινόν ὄραϊς, φρένας εἰ τινος	dactyl tetram
1153	ἀλλ' ἀνέδην ὁδε χῶρος ἐρύκεται	

- 1131 $\bar{\chi} \bar{\sigma} \cup - \cup - \parallel^b$
 1154 ἔχεις τὸν Ἡράκλειον
 οὐκέτι φοβητὸς ὑμῖν, ia dim cat
- 1132 $- \cup \cup - \cup - \parallel^{b,h}$
 1155 ὀθλίον ὦδέ σοι
 ἔρπετε, νῦν καλὸν dodrans A
- 1133 $- \cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup \cup$
 1156 οὐκέτι χρῆσόμενον τὸ μεθύστερον
 ἀντίφονον κορέσαι στόμα πρὸς χάριν dactyl tetram
- 1134 $\bar{\sigma} - - \cup - \cup -$
 1157 ἄλλου δ' ἐν μεταλλαγαῖ
 ἡμᾶς σαρκὸς αἰόλας· mol /ba (?) + ia
- 1135 $\cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup \cup - \parallel^c$
 1158 πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρὸς ἐρέσσει,
 ἀπὸ γὰρ βίον αὐτίκα λείψω. paroem
- 1136 $\cup - \cup - - \cup \cup -$
 1159 ὀρῶν μὲν αἰσχροῦς ἀπάτας chor dim B
 πόθεν γὰρ ἔσται βιότα;
- 1137 $\bar{\sigma} - \cup - - \cup \cup - \parallel^b$
 1160 στυγνὸν τε φῶτ' ἐχθοδοπὸν,
 τίς ὦδ' ἐν αὐραῖς τρέφεται, chor dim B
- 1138 $- \cup \cup - - \bar{\sigma} \bar{\chi} \cup -$
 1161 μυρί' ἀπ' αἰσχροῶν ἀνατέλ- chor dim/chor dim A
- 1139 $- \cup \cup - - \cup \cup - \cup - - \parallel^{b,c}$
 1162 λουθ' ὅσ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν κάκ' ἐμήσατ' Ἰὸδυσσεύς†
 νων ὅσα πέμπει βιόδωρος αἴα; chor dim + --- (?)
- 1140 $- - - \cup \cup - \cup \cup - \cup - \parallel^b$
 1163 ἀνδρὸς τοι τὸ μὲν εὖ δίκαιον εἰπεῖν,
 πρὸς θεῶν εἴ τι σέβῃ ξένον, πέλασσον phal
- 1141 $- - - \cup - \cup \cup -$
 1164 εἰπόντος δὲ μὴ φθονεράν
 εὐνοίαι πάσαι πελάτταν· chor dim B
- 1142 $- - - - \cup \cup -$
 1165 ἔξῳσαι γλώσσας ὀδύναν.
 ἀλλὰ γνῶθ', εὖ γνῶθ', ἐπὶ σοι chor dim B
- 1143 $- \bar{\sigma} - \cup \cup - - \parallel^c$
 1166 κείνος δ' εἰς ἀπὸ πολλῶν
 κῆρα τάνδ' ἀποφεύγειν· pher

- 1144 ταχθεις τοῦδ' ἔφημοσύναι
 1167 οἰκτρὰ γὰρ βόσκειν, ἀδαῆς δ'
- chor dim B
- 1145 κοινὰν ἤνυσεν ἐς φίλους ἄρωγῆν.
 1168 ἔχειν μυρίον ἄχθος ὧι ξυνοικεῖ.
- phai

Strophe and antistrophe β resemble strophe and antistrophe α in their aeolo-choriambic metre (with an admixture of dactylic tetrameter and iambic cola). There are apparent freedoms of responsion in 1124/1147, where a glyconic in the strophe corresponds with a choriambic dimeter B in the antistrophe; in 1128/1151, where a regular glyconic in the strophe corresponds with a 'dragged' glyconic in the antistrophe (φίλων/ἀλκάν); and in 1138/1161, where a regular choriambic dimeter in the strophe corresponds with a choriambic dimeter A in the antistrophe. The metre of 1134/1157, a kind of syncopated iambic dimeter in which a molossos (— — —) in the strophe corresponds with a bacchiac (— —) in the antistrophe, is highly uncertain. In 1133-4/1156-7, a dactylic tetrameter is followed by a colon beginning with a light syllable (cf. 142-3/157-8, 1091-2/1112-13, 1093-4/1114-15, and the metrical analysis of strophe and antistrophe α of the *parodos*). There is 'epic correction' in 1130 ἡ που ἐλαινόν and 1135 πολυμηχάνου ἀνδρός, and synizesis in 1163, (cf. 195-6n.)

Metre: astrophic amoibaion

- 1169 πάλιν, πάλιν παλαιὸν ἄλ-
- ia dim
- 1170 γημ' ὑπέμναςας, ὦ
- cr dim
- 1171 λῶιστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων.
- lektyh
- 1172 τί μ' ὦλεσας; τί μ' εἰργασαι;
- iamb dim
- 1173-4 τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; εἰ σὺ τὰν [ἔμοι]
- iamb dim
- 1175 στυγερὰν Τρωιάδα γὰρ μ' ἥλπισας ἄξειν.
- ion trim
- 1176 τόδε γὰρ νοῶ κράτιστον.
- anacr
- 1177 ἀπὸ νῦν με λείπειτ' ἡδη.
- anacr
- 1178 φίλα μοι, φίλα ταῦτα παρήγει-
- ion trim sync

1179a	λας ἐκόντι τε πράσσειν	ion dim sync
1179b	ἴωμεν, ἴωμεν	ion colarion or reiz
1180	ναὸς ἴν' ἡμῖν τέτακται.	chor dim A
1181	μή, πρὸς ἀραίου Διός, ἔλ-	chor dim
1182-3	θης, ἱκετεύω. μετρίαζ', ὦ ξένοι	chor dim + —
1184-5	μείνατε, πρὸς θεῶν. τί θροεῖς;	chor dim
1186	αἰαῖ αἰαῖ,	2 sp
1187	δαίμων, δαίμων· ἀπόλωλ' ὁ τάλας·	anap dim
1188	ὦ πούς, πούς, τί σ' ἔτ' ἐν βίῳ	glyc
1189	τεύξω τῷ μετόπιν, τάλας;	glyc
1190	ὦ ξένοι, ἔλθετ' ἐπήλυδες αὖθις.	dact tetram
1191	τί ρέξοντες; ἀλλόκοτος	chor dim B
1192	γνώμα τῶν πάρος ἂν προφαίνεις.	hipp
1193	οὔτοι νεμεσητὸν	reiz
1194	ἀλύοντα χειμερίῳ	chor dim B
1195	λύπαι καὶ παρὰ νοῦν θροεῖν	glyc
1196	βᾶθί νυν, ὦ τάλαν, ὥς σε κελεύομεν.	dact tetram
1197	οὐδέποτ', οὐδέποτ' ἴσθι τόδ' ἔμπεδον,	dact tetram
1198	οὐδ' εἰ πυρφόρος ἄστεροπητῆς	dact tetram
1199	βροντᾶς αὐγαῖς μ' εἰσι φλογίζων.	dact tetram

1200	ἐρρέτω Ἰλιον, οἱ θ' ὑπ' ἐκείνῳι	dact tetram
1201	πάντες ὅσοι τόδ' ἔτλασαν ἐμοῦ ποδός	dact tetram
1202	ἄρθρον ὀπώσῃαι.	dact dim
1203	[ἀλλ'] ὦ ξένοι, ἐν γέ μοι εὖχος ὀρέξατε.	dact tetram
1204	ποῖον ἐρεῖς τόδ' ἔπος; ξίφος, εἴ ποθεν	dact tetram
1205	ἦ γένυν, ἦ βελέων τι, προσπέμψατε.	dact tetram
1206	ὥς τίνα <δῆ> ῥέξις παλάμαν ποτέ;	dact tetram
1207–8	κρᾶτ' ἀπὸ πάντα καὶ ἄρθρα τέμω χερσί·	dact tetram
1209	φονᾶι, φονᾶι νόος ἦδη.	enhoplian
1210	τί ποτε; πατέρα ματεύων.	ia dim cat
1211	ποῖ γὰρ; ἐς Αἰδου. ^c	sp + sync ia
1212	οὐ γὰρ [ἔστ'] ἐν φάει γ' ἔτι.	lekyth
1213	ὦ πόλις, [ὦ] πόλις πατρία	chor dim B
1214	πῶς ἂν εἰσίδοιμί σ' ἄθλιός γ' ἀνὴρ,	aceph ia trim
1215	ὅς γε σὺν λιπῶν ἱερὰν	chor dim B
1216	λιβάδ' ἔβαν ἐχθροῖς Δαναοῖς	chor dim B
1217	ἄρωγός; ἔτ' οὐδὲν εἰμι.	hag

This long, astrophic lyric dialogue, like other such dialogues and monodies in the late plays of Soph. and Eur. (e.g. *OC* 207–53, Eur. *Pho.* 1485–1581, *Or.* 1369–1502, *Ba.* 576–603), shows greater metrical variety than do strophe and antistrophe α and β (cf. West 1982: 136). The metre shifts from iambic (1169–1173–4) to ionic-anacreontic (1175–9b) to aeolo-choriambic cola (1180–95), followed by a

run of dactylic tetrameters (1196–1207–8) culminating in a clausular enhoplian at 1209. Then the *kommos* ends with three lines of iambic cola (1210–12), followed by five lines mainly in aeolic (1213–17), though textual corruption and the astrophic composition of this lyric dialogue make it difficult to be certain of the colometry and period boundaries. The analysis given here is necessarily tentative and partial, and quite different analyses are possible (cf. West 1982: 136). In any case, the individual names of the metrical units are less important than the fact that there is far greater metrical and musical variation than in the preceding strophes and antistrophes, with changes of mood mirrored throughout by rhythmic changes that imply more varied and animated movement on the part of both Phil. and the Chorus, in accordance within their contradictory sentiments and strong emotion. There is epic correction in 1190 ξένου ἔλθεται, 1200 ἐρρέτω ἴλιον, 1203 ξένου ἐν γέ μοι εὖχος, and 1207–8 καὶ ἄρθρα and synizesis of ε and ω in 1185 θεῶν (cf. 195–6n.).

1081–1100 Phil. sings the opening fourteen lines of strophe α, again apostrophizing his rock-cave and lamenting his helplessness at the loss of his bow and imminent death as prey for the birds which he himself used to hunt for food (cf. 952–8). The Chorus respond in six lines, telling him, in effect, that he himself is responsible for his situation, that he chose the worse rather than the better lot.

1081 κοίλας . . . γύαλον ‘hollow of cavernous rock’, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 189 πέτρινα γύαλα.

1082 θερμὸν . . . παγετῶδες ‘hot (in summer) and icy cold (in winter)’. Contrast Phil.’s realism with Od.’s idyllic description of the cave at 17–19. παγετῶδες occurs only here in Soph. Elsewhere it is used in ‘scientific’ discussions of water (Hipp. *Aër.* 7) or air (Arist. *de Mundo* 392b6).

1082–5 ὥς σ’ . . . συνείσῃ ‘so I was not, after all, going to leave you (behind), never, wretch that I am, but you will be conscious of me also (as I am) dying’. Cf. *El.* 92–3 τὰ δὲ παννυχίδων . . . στυγεραὶ | ξυνίσας εὖναι μογερῶν οἰκων. Reiske’s emendation, συνείσῃ, is fut. mid. of σύννοϊδα. συνοίση, the reading of the MSS, is fut. mid. of συμφέρω and should mean ‘you will be agreeable to me’ or ‘you will suit me’ (cf. LSJ *s.v.* συμφέρω III.2, 3.), though several scholia, which gloss συνοίση, confuse it with fut. act. συνοίσεις ‘you will confer a benefit’. One scholion however, must be commenting on a text containing συνείσει: σύν ἐμοὶ ἔσῃ καὶ ὄψει με ἀποθανόντα. ἄρ’, ὦ τάλας: for the position of ἄρα in the sentence, cf. 978 with 978–9n. ἄρα with μέλλω suggests that ‘the predestination of an event is realized *ex post facto*’ (*GP* 36). Cf. *Aj.* 925–7 ἔμελλες, τάλας, ἔμελλες χρόνῳ | στερεόφρων ἄρ’ ἐξανύσσειν κακὰν | μοῖραν. For the accent on ὦ, see 254n.

1087–8 ὦ πληρέστατον . . . τάλαν ‘O dwelling most full of pain, the (pain) coming from me, wretched (as you are)’. With τάλαν, Phil. not only personifies his cave, to which he turns when all humans have betrayed or abandoned him, but virtually identifies it with himself (cf. 1083 τάλας) and his feelings (λύπας τὰς

ἀπ' ἑμοῦ). It is almost as if the cave has 'caught' the pain associated with Phil.'s disease (Kamerbeek 150).

1089 τίπτ' αὖ μοι τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ ἔσται lit. 'what in the world will be for me on a daily basis'? τίπτ(ε) is an epic syncopated form of τί ποτε. Cf. *Il.* 24.90 τίπτε με κείνος ἄνωγε μέγας θεός, Aesch. *Ag.* 974–7 τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπέδως | δέιμα . . . | . . . | πωτᾶται. For adverbial τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ, cf. Eur. *El.* 182–3 δακρύων δέ μοι μέλει | δειλαίαι τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ, *Ion* 123–4 λατρεύων τὸ κατ' ἡμαρ. The scholia, however, and most editors take the phrase substantivally as denoting 'my daily (nourishment)'.

1090–1 τοῦ ποτε . . . ἐλπίδος 'what hope associated with the provision of food, from where, will I, wretched (as I am), meet with'? Cf. *El.* 857–9 ἐλπίδων . . . κοινοτόκων | εὐπατριδᾶν ἄρωγαί 'supports consisting in hopes associated with having parents of noble family in common', i.e. with having a noble brother from the same parents. For such condensation of a whole phrase into an adj., cf. Campbell, *Essay* 81–2, §43. For the double question, cf. *Ant.* 401 ἄγεις δὲ τήνδε τῷ [= τίνι] τρόπῳ πόθεν λαβών, *Tr.* 421–2 τίς πόθεν μολών, Homeric τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν.

1092–4 ἴθ' . . . ἰσχύ 'come, you (who) previously (were) cowering above, through the shrill-sounding wind; I no longer have a means of taking (you)'. Cf. *Ant.* 1214–15 ἄλλα, πρόσπολοι, | ἴτ' ἄσσον ὦκεῖς, *OT* 1480 ὦ τέκνα, ποῦ ποτ' ἔστέ; δεῦρ' ἴτ' . . .

This corrupt passage has attracted many conjectures (cf. Jebb: 247–9, Jackson 1955: 114–17). The text printed and translated here is that of Jackson 1955: 115, which has been followed by most recent editors. It successfully addresses four main problems in these lines as transmitted in the MSS, εἴθ' αἰθέρος ἄνω | πτωκάδες ὀξύτόνου διὰ πνεύματος | ἔλωσί μ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἰσχύω ('Would that those cowering in the air above might seize me through the shrill-sounding wind; for I no longer have strength'): (1) εἴθ' in a wish must go with a verb in the optative, not the subjunctive; (2) the adj. πτωκάδες cannot be substantival without an accompanying definite article ('the cowering ones') or pronoun (e.g. 'you cowering ones'); (3) ἔλωσί μ' (or, in one MS, ἔλωσι) provides doubtful sense (reflected in the many alternatives to πτωκάδες mentioned by Σ as variant readings); (4) οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἰσχύω does not correspond metrically with 1115 ἐμάς λαχόντ' ἀνίας, which offers appropriate sense and metre.

πτωκάδες: πτωῶς can denote any cowering animal, but here αἰ πρόσθ' ἄνω πτωκάδες must refer to 'the formerly timid birds' in the sky, which Phil. can no longer hunt for food and which no longer need fear him, cf. 955–6, 1149–54. **πρόσθ':** an alternative to πρόσθ' might be πάρος, but this would involve a freedom of responsion with 1113 ἰδοίμαν δέ νιν in the antistrophe (~~~~~ / ~~~~). Cf. Jackson 1955: 115n.1. **ἄλωσιν** is normally used of the capture or sacking of a city (cf. 61, Aesch. *Sept.* 119, *Ag.* 589), but at Arist. *HA* 593a20 it denotes a 'means of catching' birds, at 600a3, a 'means of catching' fish.

1095-1100 the Chorus are unsympathetic and insist (1095 σύ τοι, σύ τοι) that Phil. himself is responsible for his present troubles.

1095-6 κατηξίωσας 'you thought (it) right', i.e. 'took the responsibility (for it)', cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 572 καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν ξυμφοραῖς καταξιώ.

1096-7 κοῦκ... μείζονος 'and this fortune (comes) not from another, from someone greater'. ἀπὸ μείζονος clarifies and reinforces οὐκ ἄλλοθεν. The conjecture ἀ τύχα ἄδ' (with epic correction of the final syllable of τύχα) for ἐχη τύχαι τᾷδ', the reading of the MSS, produces a dactylic tetrameter responding metrically to 1119 ἐσχ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἐμᾶς· στυγεράν ἔχε. Possibly, however, it is 1119 which is corrupt and should be emended, e.g. by Bergk's ἐσχεν ὑπὸ χειρὸς ἀμᾶς· στυγεράν ἔχε.

1098-1100 εὐτέ γε... αἰνεῖν 'because, it being possible to begin to be reasonable, rather than a better fate you chose to approve what is worse'. The whole clause explains 1095 κατηξίωσας. εὐτε, an Ionic equivalent of ὅτε, is common in epic and Ionic prose but rare in lyric and tragedy. It normally means 'when', but sometimes, as here, expresses causality, cf. *Aj.* 716-17 εὐτέ γε... | Αἴας μετανεγνώσθη, *OC* 84-5 εὐτε νῦν ἔδρας | πρῶτων ἐφ' ὕμων τῆσδε γῆς ἔκαμψ' ἐγώ. παρόν is the so-called acc. absolute, cf. Smyth §§2059b, 2076. φρονῆσαι is ingressive aor., 'express[ing] the entrance into... a state or the beginning of [continued] action' (Smyth §1924). Cf. 1259 ἐσωφρόνησας, 1420 ἔσχον. λῶϊονος δαίμονος is gen. of comparison, expressing the rejected alternative: 'you chose to approve what is worse (τὸ κάκιον) rather than the better lot'. λῶϊονος for τοῦ λῶϊονος, the reading of the MSS, preserves metrical responsion with 1121 καὶ γὰρ ἐμοί, while conforming to the avoidance in tragedy of epic correction with ωι before ο (though correction of αι or οι before ο is permitted). δαίμων originally means a god, then a human lot or destiny ordained or brought about by a god; cf. *OT* 1194 τὸν σὸν δαίμονα, *El.* 1306 ὁ παρὼν δαίμων. δαίμων differs from τύχη 'fortune', because it lacks an element of randomness or chance (cf. 1316-20n.); it is often used loosely without reference to a divine intention or effect.

αἰνεῖν 'accept', 'approve', cf. 889-92n. This emendation removes the awkwardness of εἴλου... ἐλεῖν and restores exact metrical responsion with 1122 (ἀπ)ώσηι.

1101-22 Phil., without responding directly to the Chorus, continues to lament his isolation and helplessness for another twelve lines. He blames the 'unlooked for and secret words of a treacherous mind' and wishes that 'the man who contrived these things' might feel the same pain he himself feels and for as long a time (1111-15). Phil.'s repeated use of first-person forms in 1101-15 suggests a need to affirm his existence and selfhood, when they seem, in effect, to have been nullified (cf. 1003n.). The Chorus, perhaps feeling included in Phil.'s curse against Od. (or taking it as a curse against Ne.), tell Phil. that what happened to him was the gods' doing, not theirs; therefore he should not turn his curse against them and reject their friendship.

1102 **λωβατός:** an epic word (*Il.* 24.531, cf. Homeric λώβη, λωβάομαι), describing someone who has been treated indecently and outrageously and made into an object of public revilement. Cf. *Il.* 9.387, where Achilles will not return to the fighting 'until [Agamemnon] pays me back all [my] heart-rending outrage' (λώβην). Phil. resembles Achilles in his intransigence and unwillingness to compromise in the face of mistreatment.

1102-5 **δς... ὀλοῦμαι** 'I who now, with (the company of) no one henceforth of men, dwelling here wretched in time to come, will perish here'. The sequence of temporal adverbs is highly emotional and not merely redundant: ἤδη, frequently joined with other words indicating time (cf. 1461-2, LSJ s.v. η), refers to the general situation in which Phil. now finds himself; ὕστερον by position is felt with μετ' οὐδενός... ἀνδρῶν; εἰσοπίσω modifies both τάλας and ναίων, cf. *Aj.* 858 πανύστατον δὴ κούποτ' αὐθις ὕστερον. ἐνθάδ' goes closely with both ναίων and ὀλοῦμαι.

1107-10 **οὐ... ἴσχω:** the repetition of οὐ at the beginning of successive lines is emphatic: the first οὐ goes with προσφέρων governing φορβάν as its object; the second οὐ goes with an understood προσφέρων modified by the adverbial phrase πτανῶν... ὀπλων. Phil., in his misery, for the first time refers to his φορβάν, a word which normally denotes animal rather than human food, but was used by Od. in 43 of the food that Phil. would bring home to the cave (cf. 43-4n.) and by the Chorus in 706-7 of the 'seed of holy Earth' that Phil. does not gather. προσ- in προσφέρων suggests the direction in which Phil. thinks of himself as bringing the φορβάν, i.e. toward the cave. **ἴσχω** has as its (understood) object the bow that Phil. used to hold in his hands, when he hunted for food, not the food itself, cf. 1094 ἴσχω.

1111-12 **ἀλλὰ μοι... φρενός** 'but unlooked for, hidden (i.e. 'deceptive') words from a treacherous mind stole upon me'. The treacherous mind is that of Od., whose words were 'unlooked for, hidden' because they were spoken by Ne., whom Phil. had no reason to suspect. For ὑποδύω, -δύνω with the dat., cf. *Od.* 10.398 πᾶσιν δ' ἡμερόεις ὑπέδυν γόος; the acc. is more common. The verb is frequently used of something slipping into or over someone or insinuating itself (e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 842 = 875 τίς μ' ὑποδύεται πλευράς ὀδύνα, Hdt. 6.2.1 ὑπέδυνε τῶν ἰώνων τὴν ἡγεμονίην). On the prefix υπο-, cf. 1007 with n., *OT* 386, 387, *El.* 297.

1113 **ἰδοίμαν:** the mid. suggests that the seeing would give Phil. particular satisfaction; cf. 351 εἰδόμην.

1114-15 **τὸν ἴσον... ἀνίας:** cf. 794-5.

1116-20 **πότμος, (πότμος)... ἄλλοις** 'these things (got hold of) you as doom, doom from the gods, nor did treachery by my hand (get hold of you). Aim your hateful curse of bitter doom against others'. The second πότμος brings about metrical and rhetorical respiration with σύ τοι, σύ τοι at the corresponding position in the strophe. Both repetitions reflect the Chorus' urgent desire to justify themselves at Phil.'s expense. ἔσχεν does double duty as the main verb in both

clauses, although they are joined by a coordinating conjunction, οὐδέ, which should make them grammatically independent of one another. τόδε is subj. of ἔσχεν, σε is dir. obj., and πότμος, (πότμος) is pred. This is more idiomatic than taking πότμος, (πότμος) as subj. of ἔσχεν, σε as dir. obj., and τάδε as adv. acc. of respect. Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 750 πῶς τὰδ' οὐ νόσος φρενῶν | εἶχε παῖδ' ἐμόν 'how did these things not take hold of my son as a disease of the mind?' The Chorus are disingenuous, when they say, 'Treachery by my hand did not (get hold of you).' They have helped in the intrigue against Phil., since they first came on the scene (cf. 135-6, 391-402, 507-18), and they actually proposed stealing the bow and leaving Phil. behind when he was sleeping, after his paroxysm (836-8, 845-64). The Chorus' reference to 'doom, doom from the gods' is self-serving and hypocritical, though these words may invite a viewer or reader to consider 'the problematic and imperfect complicity which exists between the plan of Odysseus and the destiny willed by the gods' (Pucci 286). ἔχε... ἄλλοις 'aim your hateful curse of bitter doom against others'. For ἔχω 'aim' or 'direct' (a weapon), see LSJ s.v. II.8. For ἐπί + dat. in a hostile sense, cf. 1139, OT 507-8 ἐπ' αὐτῶι | πτερόεσσ' ἦλθε κόρα.

1121-2 καὶ... ἀπόσῃ 'for in fact this is a concern to me, that you not rebuff my friendship'. μή = ὅπως μή. In effect, the obj. clause is in apposition to τοῦτο.

1123-45 Phil. begins strophe β as if the Chorus had not intervened and he were continuing directly from 1115. Without naming Od., he envisions him as the bow's new, 'much-contriving master', laughing at Phil. as he wields the weapon which Phil. himself will never again use. Then he movingly apostrophizes the bow itself, which (he says) pities him as it 'see[s] the shameful deceits and hated face' of 'the man who devised evils against me' (1136-9). Once again, as in strophe and antistrophe α, the Chorus respond impersonally: it is 'a man's part to say what is right', but 'having spoken, not to put forth painful speech' (1140-2). Ne. (or Od.), they continue, was merely following orders, acting as an individual on behalf of 'many men', and he performed a 'public benefit for his friends' (1143-5).

1123-4 καὶ πον... ἐφήμενος 'and, doubtless, sitting on the sea's white-capped shore...'. Cf. *Il.* 1.350 θῖν' ἐφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς, 4.248 πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης, *Od.* 5.82 ἀλλ' ὁ γ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς κλαῖε καθήμενος. At 1123 πολιᾶς describes the shore, not, as in Homer, the sea, perhaps because 'πόντου θινὸς form a single notion' (Jebb). In Homeric epic and archaic lyric poetry, wronged or helpless humans go down to, or sit alone on, the shore and call for divine aid and support (e.g. *Il.* 1.34-5, 349-50, Pind. *Ol.* 1.71-3). An audience familiar with these scenes would have appreciated the bitterness in Phil.'s vision of Od. on the seashore, mocking the man he wronged and reduced to helplessness.

1125 γελαῖ μου: cf. 257-8, 1023 with 1023-4n. There is no other example in a classical author of γελάω governing the gen., but καταγελάω regularly does so (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1081 καταγελαῖς ἤδη σύ μου, Hdt. 5.68.1 κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυωνίων), as do other words of scorning and belittling, such as καταφρονέω,

δλιγωρέω. γεῤῥι gains force from the metrical shift to a light syllable as the first element of a new colon at the beginning of the line, after heavy syllables as the first element in new cola at the beginning of the two previous lines. Cf. 173 νοσεῖ.

1125–6 χερὶ . . . τροφάν lit. ‘brandishing in his hand my means of nourishing of wretched (me)’. For the double possessive, adj. and pron., cf. *OC* 344 τὰμὰ δυστήνου κακά, Eur. *El.* 366 πόσις ἐμὸς τῆς ἀθλίας. The bow is also referred to as τροφήν ‘means of nourishing’ at 953; cf. 931, 1282–3.

1127 οὐδεὶς ποτ’ ἐβάστασεν: i.e. no one except for Phil. and Ne. ἐβάστασεν suggests a reverent handling, with respect for the bow’s divine associations, cf. 655–7. Od., by contrast, speaks only of having power over it and of his and Teukros’ instrumental knowledge of how to use it (1057–9).

1128–39 This long sentence begins with an apostrophe of the bow itself, which Phil. has just described Od. as brandishing (1127–8); it continues with a description of what the bow sees and understands – that he (Phil.) will never again use it, but that it will be ‘wielded by a much-devising man’ (1129–35); it ends with the bow’s vision of ‘shameful deceits’ and the ‘detestable enemy’ who has ‘contrived against me myriad evils arising from shameful (arts)’ (1136–9).

1128–9 ὦ . . . ἐκβεβιασμένον ‘O you dear bow, from dear hands violently forced’. The chiasmus – τόξον, φίλον . . . φίλων . . . ἐκβεβιασμένον – heightens the emotional intensity of Phil.’s lament. The bow is subjected to the same kind of violence as Phil. himself, cf. gon. By calling the bow φίλον ‘dear’, Phil. implies a reciprocal solidarity between it and himself, in effect personifying it, and he continues this personification with 1130–1 ἐλινὸν ὀρᾷς, φρένας εἴ τινας | ἔχεις. ‘Dear hands’ recalls the common Homeric use of φίλος to describe a part of the body as ‘friendly’ (e.g. *Il.* 7.130, 19.209, *Od.* 5.462, 12.331), especially when that part is conceived of as cooperating practically with the purposes of the self or when an emotional or affective quality in the relationship between the self and the part is suggested by the context in which φίλος occurs. (This Homeric use is often considered merely ‘possessive’, but cf. Benveniste 1973: 282–8; Fränkel 1975: 82–3.)

1130–9 ἦ που . . . ἴ’Οδυσσεύς† lit. ‘surely you, pitiable, see with pity, if you have any sense to feel, the Herakleian man, thus wretched, who will no longer use you in the future, but with a change to the possession of another, a much-devising man, you are plied – seeing shameful deceits and (my) hated enemy, (seeing) the myriad evils arising from shameful (deceits), as many as (he) contrived against us’. ἦ που is strongly affirmative (*GP* 285–6). Adverbial ἐλινόν suggests both that the bow looks with pity and that it is to be pitied for what it sees. For the combination of thought and feeling in φρένας . . . τινας, cf. *Tr.* 313 δσωπιπερ καὶ φρονεῖν οἶδεν μόνῃ ‘in as much as she is the only one who has the sense to feel her position’ (Jebb).

1131 τὸν Ἡράκλειον: Phil., because of his association with the man and the bow. Σ glosses τὸν . . . ἄθλιον as ‘me, the successor (διάδοχον) of Herakles’,

or 'me, the one having made the pyre as a prize for Herakles, having kindled it'. For the omission of ἐμέ or με, cf. 769, 801, 1170.

1134-5 ἄλλου... ἐρέσση: with ἄλλου δ' for ἄλλ', there is perfect respon-sion between 1134 and 1157 in the antistrophe; ἄλλου indicates the person into whose ownership the bow is transferred 'with a change' (ἐν μεταλλαγῇ). ἐρέσσω 'row' = νωμάω 'ply' is used figuratively for the motion of arms, legs, and wings (cf. Friis Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 541, Garvie on Aesch. *Pers.* 1046) and for mental activities, but nowhere else with reference to an object like the bow. Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 854-6 γοῶν... κατ' οὔρον | ἐρέσ-σεν' ἀμφὶ κρατὶ πόμπιμον χεροῖν | πίτυλον 'on the wind of lamentation ply the beating of hands about the head in accompaniment', Eur. *Id.* 139 ἄλλ' ἴθ' ἐρέσσω σὸν πόδα. Cf. *Aj.* 251 τοίاس ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπειλας, *Ant.* 158 τίνα δὴ μῆτιν ἐρέσσω;

1136-9 ὀρῶν... Ὀδυσσεύς: ὀρῶν is neut., agreeing with 1128 τόξον and governing three direct objects: αἰσχροῦς ἀπάτας, στυγνόν... φῶτ' ἐχθοδοπόν, and μυρὶ'... ἀνατέλλονθ'. For corresponding μέν... τε, cf. 1056-9n, 1424-7. φῶτ' ἐχθοδοπόν = ἐχθρόν (substantival). Ὀδυσσεύς probably was a marginal gloss that entered the text by a copyist's mistake, displacing a two-syllable word that was in metrical respon-sion with the final two syllables of 1123. It is impossible to know what this word was. One plausible conjecture is οὔτος, which would refer to Odysseus; another is οὐδεῖς, with which 1139 would mean 'as many evils as no one (previously) had contrived against us', i.e. 'more evils than anyone (previously) had contrived...'.

1140-2 ἀνδρός τοι... δδύναν lit. '(it is) the part of a man to assert his own claim (or "case")', but, on the other hand (it is the part of a man) when he has asserted (his own claim), not to thrust forth malicious pain from his tongue', i.e. not to hurt with rancorous speech. γλώσσας hovers between 'tongue' (the physical organ) and 'speech', but ἐξῶσαι (aor. inf. of ἐξωθέω, a strong word suggesting the application of physical force) gives an image of the tongue 'thrusting forth' from the mouth like a weapon. (Kamerbeek *ad loc.* thinks of a bee-sting.) For the reflexive possessive ὄν with the article, an epicism, cf. *Tr.* 266 τῶν ὄν τέκνων, 525 τὸν ὄν... ἀκοίταν. For τὸ δίκαιον = 'claim', 'case' (with a possessive), see Eur. *Id.* 810 τοῦμόν μὲν οὖν δίκαιον ἐμέ λέγειν χρεῶν (or χρέος), cf. LSJ *s.v.* δίκαιος B.1.2. The Chorus acknowledge that Phil. has spoken appropriately, but they accuse him of going beyond what is fitting, out of malice toward Od. The unusual expression, γλώσσας δδύναν, suggests that the Chorus too are thinking of Od. as the master of strategic speech (cf. 96-9), as the rancorous speaker, not only Phil., and Odysseus' name may perhaps be heard (by a kind of play) in the word δδύναν.

1143-5 κείνος... ἀρωγάν: the Chorus' comment is plainly defensive, but it is not certain whom they are defending. They do not name either Od. or Ne., and in this way they create an ambiguity that leaves it up to the audience

or readers to judge for themselves. That said, the obvious meaning of τοῦδ' ἐφημοσύνη is 'at the behest (or "command") of this man', in which case τοῦδ' should refer to Od., and κείνος to Ne. This also seems likely because in 1134–9 Phil. has been unmistakably referring to Od. (πολυμήχανου ἀνδρός, αἰσχρὰς ἀπάτης), and the Chorus' κείνος should refer to someone more 'remote'. They are concerned to justify their own king, (cf. 1095–1101, 1116–21) and, if κείνος refers to Ne., they do so on the ground that he was merely following orders (Pucci 288). On the other hand, Od. uses ταχθεῖς in 6 to describe himself as 'ordered' by his commanders (τῶν ἀνασσόντων) ten years earlier to maroon Phil. on Lemnos, and Phil. recalls this claim at 1028 (cf. 1024), so κείνος . . . ταχθεῖς might well call to mind Od. **εἰς ἀπὸ πολλῶν:** the Chorus adapt for their own rhetorical purposes a partitive use of ἀπὸ that usually emphasizes, sometimes with pathos, the disparity between the part and the greater whole. Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 1023 βαιά γ' ὡς ἀπὸ πολλῶν, Thuc. 1.110.1 ὅλῳ ἀπὸ πολλῶν . . . ἐσώθησαν. Here, however, there is no question of disparity, but clear sympathy for the 'one out of many' who acted on behalf of the many.

1146–68 Phil. utterly ignores the Chorus' defence of Ne. (or Od.), turning instead to his natural surroundings and again (cf. 1092–4) calling on the birds and wild beasts to fear him no longer – wretched and helpless as he now is – but to come and 'glut themselves freely, taking blood for blood' from his discoloured flesh (1156–7, cf. 957–60). The Chorus, who pitied Phil. as early as 169–90, are again moved by his helplessness, and in the final six lines of the antistrophe they beseech him, in the name of the gods, to understand that they are his friends and to use his power to escape from his painful destiny. They clearly want him to accompany them to Troy, in his own interest as well as the army's, so they return to their argument in the first strophe that he himself is responsible for and in control of his destiny.

1146–8 ὦ . . . οὐρεσιβώτας 'O (you) winged prey and bands of wild beasts with flashing[?] eyes, whom this place has feeding in (its) mountains'. Cf. 955. Phil.'s apostrophe of the Lemnian birds and beasts has an epic flavour: ἔθνος, which in classical Greek had come to mean mainly a tribe, nation, or people, is often used in Homer of various groups of animals, including flights of birds (*Il.* 2.459, 15.691); at *Od.* 11.611 χαροποί describes the lions seen by Odysseus on the golden belt worn by the εἰδῶλον of Herakles, perhaps with reference to the amber colour of their eyes (Maxwell-Stuart 1981: 3, 61) or their 'look full of the joy of battle' (Risch 1974: 172). At *Od.* 11.607 the εἰδῶλον is holding a bow with an arrow on the bowstring, so 1146 χαροπῶν may recall the bow of Herakles with which Phil. had formerly hunted in order to survive; 1146 πταναί (cf. 1109) also recalls this weapon and its food-providing function. (χαροπός was considered sufficiently 'epic' to be used of apes at *Ar. Pax* 1065, in a hexameter comically alluding to the Spartans.) **οὐρεσιβώτας** 'feeding in the mountains', a word which occurs nowhere else, has an epic flavour and rhythm. It probably is acc.

plur. of οὐρεσιβώτης (cf. *Il.* 12.299 λέων ὀρεσίτροφος), not nom. singular, in which case it would agree with ὅδ' . . . χῶρος: 'this place of feeding (or 'this place providing food') in the mountains'.

1149–50 φυγαῖ μηκέτ' . . . ἔλατ' 'no longer rush from my lodging in flight', i.e. 'no longer flee from my lodging'. After calling on the birds and 'tribes of wild beasts' (1146–8), Phil. commands them. But the text is uncertain, and both μηκέτ' and ἔλατ' – imper. of ἐλάω, a poetic pres. form of ἐλαύνω – are emendations. In the MSS, Phil. says, φυγαῖ μ'οὔκέτ' ἄπ' αὐλίων | πελαῖτ' 'you will no longer approach me with flight' (i.e. 'by fleeing') from my lodging'. 'Approach me with flight' is perhaps Phil.'s boldly oxymoronic way of describing how the birds and wild beasts used to approach his cave, only to flee when he began to shoot arrows at them. This oxymoron, however, is difficult to believe in, and it seems more reasonable to accept Auratus' μηκέτ' and Canter's ἔλατ'. Intrans. ἐλαύνω is rare, but cf. *El.* 734–5 ἤλαυνε δ' ἔσχατος . . . | Ὀρέστης, *Eur. Hcl.* 903–4 ὁ <δ> . . . ἐγγὺς μανιᾶν ἐλαύνει, *Ba.* ἔξω . . . ἐλαύνων τοῦ φρονεῖν. See LSJ, *s.v.* ἐλαύνειν 1.b.6

1153–7 ἀλλ' . . . αἰόλας 'but move freely – this place, no longer to be feared by you, wards off (enemies) for itself; now it is fine (καλόν), returning slaughter for slaughter, to glut your mouths at your pleasure on my discoloured flesh'. ἀνέδην 'freely', 'without restraint', is emphatically positioned at the beginning of the line and the sentence and separated from ἔρπιτε, which it modifies. The parenthesis, ὅδε . . . ἐρύκεται, gives the reason for this emphasis. ἐρύκω ('check', 'stop', 'ward off') can be used in the active voice without an expressed object (e.g. *Il.* 15.297 εἴ κεν πρῶτον ἐρύξομεν ἀντιάσαντες), and here this usage is extended to the middle voice.

ἀντίφονον is proleptic: the mouth will be 'returning slaughter for slaughter' *after* it has glutted itself on Phil.'s 'discoloured (or perhaps "quivering") flesh', but the adj. comes first, anticipating the condition of the mouth once the action of 'glutting' has taken place. Cf. *El.* 248 ἀντιφόνους δίκας, *Aesch. Eum.* 982 ποινὰς ἀντιφόνους ἔτας. Phil. imagines the animals, whom he formerly killed and ate, killing and eating him in a process of natural justice, which stands in contrast to the absence of justice – at least for Phil. – in the human realm. Cf. 956–9.

αἰόλας denotes something quick-moving or nimble; it is usually applied to light or colour, and often means 'shining', 'gleaming', 'shimmering', 'variegated', or 'of changing hue'. Here it probably refers to the surface appearance of Phil.'s flesh, which has become livid or spotted because of his disease (cf. Σ ποικίλος διὰ τὰ τραύματα). In Homer, however, αἰόλος also describes the rapid movement of a horse's feet (*Il.* 19.404), of 'wriggling' worms (*Il.* 22.509), and of a 'darting' gadfly (*Od.* 22.300), so it could perhaps describe the 'quivering' or 'shaking' of Phil.'s flesh on account of the disease.

1160 τίς . . . τρέφεται 'who feeds himself thus on the winds?' ἐν is instrumental (cf. 60 with n.), denoting the substance fed upon. Cf. *Pl. Tim.*

81c1 τεθραμμένης... ἐν γάλακτι, *Leg.* 887d3 ἐν γάλαξι τρεφόμενοι. Wind(s) occur frequently in proverbial expressions denoting futility, e.g. ἀνέμους γεοργεῖν (-ς) (*Leutsch-Schneidewin* 1: 31, 194), δικτύωι ἄνεμον θηρᾶς (*Leutsch-Schneidewin* 1: 62), but no surviving Greek proverb refers to feeding on the winds.

1161-2 μηκέτι... αἶα 'no longer having power over anything, as many things as the life-giving earth sends (forth)'. δσ' agrees with an understood participative gen., πάντων: '... no longer having power over anything (of all things), as many as...' The participial clause μηκέτι... αἶα is, in effect, the protasis of a condition, the apodosis of which is τίς... τρέφεται. Therefore μηκέτι ('generic' μή, cf. 170, 253, 409, 415 with n., 1006) rather than οὐκέτι negates κρατύνων, since the condition applies to anyone 'no longer having power...' πέμπει: simple verb for the compound ἀναπέμπει 'sends up' (cf. 48n.), perhaps with the connotation that the earth 'is the origin of its life-giving products' (*Chadwick* 235). βιόδωρος αἶα recalls the Homeric formula φνσιζοος αἶα 'grain-growing (or "life-giving") earth', cf. 391 παμβῶτι γᾶ. Phil. has gone for ten years without harvesting food, living only on what he hunted (cf. 707-12), and he realizes that without the bow he cannot survive. Throughout antistrophe β the pathos of his situation is heightened by his use of the language of 'life' (1158, 1159, 1161) and 'feeding' (1147, 1160, 1167) to describe his inability to feed himself and to continue living (*Pucci* 290).

1163-8 The Chorus do not respond directly to Phil.'s lament, but, calling on the gods, invite him to 'approach', i.e. join them and escape his suffering, instead of calling on animals to approach and devour him (cf. 1149-50, 1153-7).

1163-4 εἴ τι... πελάτῃν 'if you in any way respect a stranger, approach with good-will the one who approaches you with good-will'. εὐνοίαι πάσαι is felt with both πέλασσον and πελάτῃν. These two cognate words occur elsewhere in the play with both negative and positive overtones: on the one hand, Ixion was 'the one who approached the bed of Zeus' (677), and Phil. was bitten by the serpent when he 'approached the guardian of Chryse' (1327); on the other, Herakles 'approached the gods, (himself) a god all-bright in divine fire, above the heights of Oita' (727-9). Although πελάζω and πελάτης do not occur elsewhere in the *kommos* (unless πελάτ' is correct in 1150), much of the astrophic dialogue between Phil. and the Chorus (1169-1217) is in terms of approach and withdrawal, welcome and rejection, coming and going. In the end Phil. refuses to 'approach' the Chorus, despite their expressed desire that he not 'rebuff [their] friendship' (1121-2), and they remain ξένοι (1184, 1203), not φίλοι. In the end, Phil. does (literally) approach Ne., leaning on him for physical support (1403), as they depart for the ship, and Phil. reciprocates this support as a φίλος, when he promises to use his Heraklean arrows to prevent the Greeks - their common enemies - from 'approaching' (πελάζειν) Ne.'s land to lay it waste (1405-7). Cf. *Pucci* 291. θεῶνι for the synizesis of ε and ω, cf. 196n.

1165 ἀλλὰ... γνῶθ' ἀλλὰ is common in entreaties and with γνῶθ' εὖ γνῶθ' expresses 'a maximum of urgency' (Kamerbeek).

1165–6 ἐπι... ἀποφύγειν 'to flee this death-doom is in your power'. For ἐπι σοί 'in your power', cf. 1003, *OC* 66 ἢ 'πὶ τῷ πληθεὶ λόγος;

1167–8 οἰκτρὰ... ξυνοικεῖ 'for it (the κήρ) is pitiable to feed (*sc.* with your own flesh), and cannot be taught to bear the infinite burden with which it makes its home'. In the first clause, the κήρ (cf. 41–2n.) is separate from the person who feeds it with his flesh (cf. 41–2, 313), but in the second clause the κήρ and the person have merged, are identified with one another as a single entity, which is said to cohabit with the burden (of suffering) produced by the κήρ. For ξυνοικέω used of a torment or evil so closely combined with a person that it can be said to share its home, cf. *Tr.* 1055 βοφεῖ ξυνοικοῦν describing the robe that devours Herakles' flesh, *OC* 1133–4... ἀνδρὸς ὧι τίς οὐκ ἐνὶ | κηλὶς κακῶν ξύνοικος. For ξύνειμι in a similar sense, cf. *Aj.* 337–8 τοῖς πάλαι | νοσήμασι ξυνοῦσι, *OC* 945–6 γάμοι | ξυνόντες, 1243–4 δειναὶ... ἄται... ξυνοῦσαι. ἀδαής 'not able to be taught' combines α-privative with the root δα-, seen in δαῖναι, διδάσκω, etc. Cf. *DELG s.v.* διδάσκω.

1169–1217 This impassioned, astrophic exchange consists (finally) of genuine interaction and dialogue between Phil. and the Chorus, who in strophe and antistrophe α and β sing past one another and barely communicate. There are interruptions and contradictions, anger and despair: Phil. cries out to the Chorus in 1177, 1183–4, 1185, and 1190 (cf. 1193–5 οὔτοι νεμεσητὸν... θροεῖν), as he alternately appeals to them and rejects them, whenever they mention his going to Troy. He asks for a weapon with which to take his own life and seek his father in Hades (1203–11), before condensing his pain and despair into the unfulfillable wish to see the land of his fathers and the simple, resigned statement, ἔτ' οὐδὲν εἰμι 'henceforth I am nothing'. The frequent repetition of words by both Phil. and the Chorus effectively conveys the intensity and emotional urgency of their dialogue.

1169–70 πάλιν... ὑπέμναςας three consecutive words beginning with πάλ- express the burden of 'old pain' that Phil. feels at the suggestion, implicit in the Chorus' words in 1162–8, that he go with them to Troy – an emotional burden of pain even more oppressive than the physical pain associated with his disease. Cf. 622–5, 915–17, 997–1000. For the repeated word, in the opening line of a choral unit, cf. 135, 1101. For the omission of με with ὑπέμναςας, cf. 769, 801, 1131.

1171 λῶϊστε... ἐντόπων for the superlative with the gen., an epic construction (e.g. *Il.* 1.505 ὠκυμωτάτος ἄλλων), cf. *Ant.* 100–2 κάλλιστον... τῶν προτέρων φάος. ἐντόπων lit. 'those present in (this) place' (cf. 211, *OC* 1457), referring to those who happened to come to the island from time to time, since Phil. was marooned (cf. 305–6). Contrast *OC* 841, where ἐντοποὶ are indigenous or long-term residents of a place.

1172 τί μ' ὠλεσας... εἶργασαι for aor. followed by perf., cf. 676, 929–30.

1173 τοῦτ' refers to the content of the previous line (ῶλεσας... εἰργασαι); cf. *Aj.* 270 πῶς τοῦτ' ἔλεξας, referring to 269 ἡμεῖς ἄρ' οὐ νοσοῦντες ἀτώμεσθα (vñ).

1174–5 εἰ σὺ... ἄξιν: Phil. responds to the Chorus' question with emotional urgency, reflected in the *antilabē*, and explains what he means by 1172 ῶλεσας. τὸν... Τρωιάδα γὰρ without a preposition is accus. of the goal or end of motion, cf. Smyth §1588, Moorhouse 45.

1177 ἀπό νῦν με λείπεται ἤδη 'leave me now, right away'. Enclitic νῦν is common in commands, often comes second in its clause (cf. 468) and is frequently joined with another adv. For ἤδη 'immediately', 'forthwith', 'right away', see LSJ s.v. 1.2. For the tmesis, cf. 817 with 814–18n., 1158.

1178–80 φίλα μοι... ἴωμεν 'you bid me do these things (that are) dear to me, dear (to do), and (which) I am ready and willing to do. Let's be going, let's be going'. πράσσειν depends on παρήγγειλας, φίλα, and ἐκόντι (Campbell 459); μοι depends simultaneously on φίλα and παρήγγειλας. For τε linking units of the same kind but not strictly parallel to one another, cf. *GP* 497n.2. παραγγέλλω is not as strong as κελεύω – 'exhort' rather than 'command'. The repetition of ἴωμεν suggests the Chorus' readiness to take Phil. at his word and leave at once.

1181 ναὸς... τέτακται lit. 'where in the ship it has been ordered for us', i.e. to the place in the ship where each of us is stationed. ναὸς is partit. gen. of place. The sailors begin to leave, perhaps implying that the time has come for them to return to the ship (cf. 1076–7).

1182–3 πρὸς... ἱκετεύω 'don't go, by Zeus who enforces curses, I beseech (you)'. Phil. goes down on his knees or at least reaches toward the Chorus in a ritual gesture of supplication (cf. 468–506n.) in the name of Zeus, who enforces the curses of those whose supplication is rejected. This is the only example of ἀρῖος as an epithet of Zeus; it is the functional equivalent of ἱκέσιος, cf. 484 with n. ἔλθης = ἀπέλθης, simple for compound verb. Cf. 48n. μετρίαζ' 'calm down', cf. *Pl. Rep.* 603e9 μετριάσει δέ πῶς πρὸς λύπην.

1187 δαίμων, δαίμωνι: the nom. is relatively rare in direct address (*K-G* 1.48), but cf. 1213. Elsewhere in *Soph.* the voc. δαίμον is normal in exclamations, e.g. *OT* 1311 ὦ δαίμον, ἴν' ἐξήλου. In tragedy generally, ὦ (or ἰώ) is normal when gods are invoked individually or collectively. Perhaps *Soph.* here follows the convention in Homeric epic whereby gods are not, for the most part, addressed by human beings with ὦ (and rarely address one another in that way). Cf. Moorhouse 24–5.

ἀπόλωλ' ὁ τάλας! cf. 978n.

1188–9 τί σ'... τάλας 'what will I, wretched (as I am), do with you hereafter in my future life'? For ἐτι 'hereafter', 'in the future', cf. 1054, 1217, *El.* 65–6 ὡς κάμ' ἐπαυχῶ... | δεδορκότ' ἔχθροῖς ἄστρον ὥς λάμψειν ἐτι. μετόπιν (= epic μετόπισθε) occurs only here and at *Ap. Rhod.* 4.1764.

1190 ἔλθει... αὐθις lit. 'come, returning back again'. ἐπηλυς normally means 'coming to a place', but here, with αὐθις, ἐπηλυδες must denote 'coming

back' to the place from which they had just departed. For αὐθις referring to place, see LSJ *s.v.* 1.

1191–2 τί ῥέξοντες; ἀλλόκοτος... προφαίνεις 'to do what? The intention which you reveal (is) strangely different from the things (which you revealed) previously'. Punctuating with a question mark after ῥέξοντες and starting a new sentence with nom. ἀλλόκοτος, appropriately make Phil., not the Chorus, the one with the 'strangely different' intention that the Chorus should return (contrast 1177 with 1185). προφαίνεις for προῦφαινες or προῦφανε, rightly puts the emphasis on Phil.'s present state of mind (while restoring a normal aeolic *clausula*), and ἄν for ὧν makes the relative pronoun refer to this present state of mind, not to τῶν πάρος. For γνώμα 'intention', 'purpose', cf. 962, *OT* 527 οἶδα δ' οὐ γνώμη τίνι. For προφαίνω 'reveal by word', i.e. 'declare', cf. *Tr.* 324.

1193–5 οὗτοι... θροεῖν lit. 'it is not deserving of anger that a man wanders in his mind in stormy sorrow and cries out contrary to (or "beyond") reason'. νεμεσητόν, familiar from Homeric epic, occurs only here in surviving Attic tragedy. It is 'a very social word' (Winnington-Ingram 1980: 294), implying that Phil. and the Chorus share fundamental values and that his irrationality and contradictory way of speaking are within the bounds of what is socially acceptable. For ἀλύω, cf. 174. For παρὰ νοῦν, cf. 815 παραφρονεῖς, Aesch. *Sept.* 756–7 παράνοια... φρενώλης. χειμερίωι: χεῖμων, χειμέριος, χειμάζω, etc. can be used metaphorically of mental suffering, often in combination with physical suffering, cf. 1459–60, *Aj.* 206–7 θολερῶι | κέτται χειμῶνι νοστήσας, Aesch. *PV* 562–3 τόνδε χαλινοῖς ἐν πετρίνοισιν | χειμαζόμενον with Griffith's note.

1198–9 οὐδ'... φλογίζων: for a similar refusal to compromise, cf. Aesch. *PV* 1043–4 ριπτέσθω μὲν | πυρὸς ἀμφήκης βόστρυχος, 1082–4 βρυχία δ' ἡχῶ παραμυκάται | βροντῆς, ἔλικες δ' ἐκλάμπουσι | στεροπῆς. βροντή denotes the sound of thunder, but it is often confused with, or used in the sense of, κεραυνός, to signify both the sound and a visible, destructive bolt of lightning. Hence βροντᾶς αὐγαῖς 'with bright lights of thunder', though αὐγή is used more often of the light of the sun (LSJ *s.v.* αὐγή). μ' εἰσι φλογίζων 'will come burning me up'. The pres. participle after εἰμι and other verbs of motion vividly emphasizes the manner or process of coming or going (Smyth §2099, K–G II.60–1); cf. Pind. *Nem.* 7.69 ἐρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων, K–G II.60–1.

1201–2 πάντες... ἀπῶσαι lit. 'all, as many as dared to push away this limb of my foot', i.e. to reject me because of my lame foot. ποδός is gen. of definition with ἄρθρον. The basic meaning of ἄρθρον is joint or, more precisely, the socket of a joint in which the 'ball' swivels; it comes to mean 'limb' by a kind of synecdoche. When Phil. says that the Greeks have rejected 'the limb of my foot' rather than just 'my foot', he makes his situation more concrete and pathetic, implying that they rejected him by rejecting the part of his foot (cf. 748 εἰς ἄκρον πόδα with 748n.) that could no longer function effectively.

1203 ἐν γέ μοι . . . ὀρέξατε lit. 'extend me one thing prayed for', i.e. grant me one prayer. For the sense of ὀρέξατε, cf. *Od.* 15.312 πλάγξομαι, αἶ κέν τις κοτύλην καὶ πύρνον ὀρέξῃ 'I shall wander, if (i.e. 'in the hope that') someone might extend (to me) a cup and a wheat-loaf.'

1204 ποῖον . . . ἔπος: cf. 441. ἐρεῖς (fut.) indicates the intention of the speaker, what he means to say.

1204–5 ξίφος . . . προπέμψατε: ξίφος gains emphasis as the first word in the sentence and by separation from προπέμψατε, the final word, of which it is dir. obj. Presumably the fifteen members of the Chorus are and appear to be unarmed, but εἴ ποθεν indicates a hope on the part of Phil. that one of them may have a concealed weapon (Jebb). προπέμπειν, lit. 'send forth or forward', can be used of 'providing', 'furnishing', or even 'causing' objects, words, or feelings, e.g. 105, *Ant.* 1286–7 ὦ . . . προπέμψας ἄχῃ, *El.* 1155 φήμας . . . προὔπεμπες.

1206 ὥς . . . ποτέ 'so you may carry out *what* violent deed'? Cf. *El.* 390 ὅπως πάθῃς τί χρεῖμα, *OC* 398 ὅπως τί δράσῃς; 1724 ὥς τί ῥέξομεν. ποτέ has a generalizing and intensifying force: 'so you may do *what* violent deed *in the world*'? Cf. 220–1n.

παλάμαν: παλάμη originally means the palm of the hand, then the hand as used in grasping a spear or other object, e.g. *Il.* 1.238, 3.338, and then the hand generally, especially as used in deeds of violence, e.g. *Il.* 5.558 ἀνδρῶν ἐν παλάμησι κατέκταθεν ὅξεί χαλκῶι. Here, by extension, παλάμαν denotes the deed of violence itself, a sense found elsewhere only in the plural, e.g. *Il.* 3.128 ὑπ' Ἀρης παλαμάων. παλάμη also can mean, figuratively, any cunning art or device employed for better or worse, especially by the gods but also by humans. Cf. 177, Aesch. *PV.* 166 πρὶν ἂν . . . παλάμαι τινὶ | τὸν δυσάλωτον ἔλῃ τις ἀρχάν. See LSJ, *s.v.*, *DELG*, *s.v.*

1207–8 κρᾶτ' . . . ἦδη: 'let me utterly (πάντα) cut away (ἀπό) my head and my limbs; my mind now desires slaughter, desires slaughter'. Phil.'s response is unexpected and strange. The physical impossibility and the irrationality of his 'utterly' cutting away his own 'head and limbs' may have led to the conjecture χρῶτα 'flesh' for κρᾶτ'. At this point, however, Phil. is not thinking or speaking rationally, and his desperate, violent wish is dramatically appropriate, cf. 748. (πάντα could be an adj. modifying κρᾶτ' – 'my whole head' – rather than an adv., if κρᾶτ' is masc. rather than neut. sing. Cf. Eur. *Pho.* 1149 κρᾶτας, Ion fr. 61 (*TrGF* 1: 113) τύπτου τὸν αὐτοῦ κρᾶτ'.)

φονᾶι, φονᾶι: φονάω is always desiderative; cf. *Ant.* 117–19 φονῶ- | σαισιν . . . | λόγχαῖς 'with bloodthirsty spears'.

1210 πατέρα ματεύων: the participle agrees with 1209 νόος, subj. of φονᾶι, but is used as if Phil. had said φονῶ. In 492–7 Phil. fears that his father may be dead, but at 665 and 1371 he refers to him as living. His assumption changes with his hopes: when he thinks he may return home, his father is living; when not, his father is dead (Jebb 188). Eventually, in 1430 Herakles informs him that Poias is still alive. Cf. Poole 1987: 201.

1213 ὦ πόλεις, πόλεις: exclamatory nom., cf. 1187n. Phil.'s πόλεις is Trachis, though elsewhere he speaks of Malis – the region – as his native land.

1214 πῶς... εἰσίδοιμί σ': for the wish, cf. 531–2 with n., 794–5.

1215–17 ὅς γε... ἄρωγός 'I who, having left behind your holy stream, went as a support for the Danaans, my enemies.' The 'holy stream' is the Spercheios, cf. 725–6 Μηλιάδων νυμφᾶν | Σπερχειοῦ τε παρ' ὄχθας. For ἄρωγός in a military context, cf. *OC* 1011–12 κατασκήπτω λιταῖς | ἐλθεῖν ἄρωγούς ξυμμάχους θ'.

1217 ἔτ' οὐδέν εἰμι: an idiom used at moments of utter helplessness or at the point of death, cf. 951, *Tr.* 161 ὡς ἔτ' οὐκ ὦν, *OC* 393 ὅτ' οὐκέτ' εἰμί. For ἔτι 'hereafter', 'in the future', cf. 1054, 1188 with 1188–9n. On this note of despair, Phil. enters his cave, just as, at 952, after 951 οὐδέν εἰμ' ὁ δύσμορος, he turns to his 'shape of rock with two doorways' as the place where he will wither and die (954–60). The action now 'comes to a kind of full stop' (Taplin 1971: 39), an 'ending' far more desperate than that at 1402–8 before the intervention of Herakles (cf. 1402–8 n.). It seems that realpolitik has triumphed, that Ne. and Od. will take the bow to Troy, leaving Phil. to starve to death in his cave. The audience would have expected, from their knowledge of the traditional myth (and perhaps from earlier dramatic treatments), that Phil. would leave the island and help win the war, but the ambiguity throughout the play as to whether Phil. or the bow or both are needed at Troy would have invited them, at least momentarily, to think that the action had ended and to consider what that might mean. Then Ne. and Od. enter, quarrelling, and the action resumes (cf. Taplin 1971: 35–6).

1218–1471: FINAL SCENE (EXODOS)

Aristotle (*Poetics* 12.1452b21–2) calls the 'whole part of a tragedy after which there is no choral song' the *Exodos*, which here includes the final 254 lines of the play and a complex sequence of dramatic action: the Chorus Leader announces the approach of Od. and Ne. (1218–21); Od. fails to change Ne.'s decision, taken 'offstage', to return the bow to Phil. (1222–60, mostly stichomythia); Ne. calls for Phil. to come out of his cave, tries to convince him of his own sincerity, and returns the bow (1261–92); Od. intervenes to try to prevent Ne. from handing over the bow, but flees to avoid being shot by Phil. (1293–1307); Ne. tries unsuccessfully to persuade Phil. to accompany him to Troy (1308–1401); Ne. finally agrees to rescue Phil. from the island and bring him home (1401–8, trochaic tetrameters catalectic); Her. appears *ex machina* and instructs Phil. to accompany Ne. to Troy, where Phil. will be healed and the two of them will sack the city, after which Phil. is to send some spoils home to his father Poias and dedicate others at the site of Her.'s pyre (1409–17, anapaests; 1418–44, iambic trimeters); Phil. and Ne. agree to obey Herakles, Phil. bids farewell to the island, and the Chorus pray to the Nereids for a safe return home (1445–71, anapaests).

1218-21 ἐγὼ . . . ἐλεύσσομεν is the only four-line sequence of iambic trimeters in the play spoken by the Chorus Leader and the last utterance by the Chorus until their closing anapaests at 1469-71. These transitional lines, a typical, choral entry-announcement found in all the MSS (cf. 539-41), have been unconvincingly suspected as an interpolation, owing to their supposedly flawed dramatic technique, language, and style (Taplin 1971: 39-44). From the point of view of dramatic technique, the supposed problems are: (1) after the sense of a pessimistic ending, achieved at 1217 by Phil.'s εἴτ' οὐδέν εἰμι and retreat into the cave, a transitional passage linking his movement to the unexpected arrival of Od. and Ne. diminishes the surprise, when the dramatic action begins again; (2) the entry of two characters already engaged in stichomythia into a playing area that is empty except for the Chorus is highly unusual (though paralleled in extant tragedy by Eur. *Al* 303 ff., where Menelaos and the Old Man enter quarrelling over possession of the letter, and Eur. *Hipp.* 601 ff., where the conversation between Hippolytos and the Nurse is understood to have already begun indoors (cf. Taplin 1971: 39-44). The supposed problems of language and style include: (1) 1219 σοι, an unemphatic, apparently gratuitous ethical dative referring to Phil., who is now in the cave and unable to hear it; (2) the unusual use of ὁμοῦ with the gen. instead of the dat.; (3) the repetitions in the sequence στείχω . . . στείχοντα, πέλας . . . στείχοντα, and πρὸς ἡμᾶς δεῦρ' ἰόντα, which seem clumsy in contrast to the less wordy entry announcements usually found elsewhere in Attic tragedy; (4) the shift from first person sing. ἐγὼ (1218) to first person plur. ἐλεύσσομεν (1221). On close consideration, however, none of these stylistic or dramatic features, alone or in combination with the others, is so 'problematic' that the lines must be an interpolation (see below).

1218-19 ἐγὼ . . . ἐμῆς 'I, for my part, would already, as far as you're concerned (σοι), actually long since be moving (to be) near my ship' is the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition in present time, of which εἰ μὴ . . . ἐλεύσσομεν is the protasis. μέν, with no corresponding δέ, gives emphasis to ἐγὼ ('I, for my part') (cf. 965-6n.). With στείχω the direction of the walking, coming, or going is often provided by a preposition or by the context (LSJ *s.v.*); here the prepositional phrase νῶς ὁμοῦ . . . ἐμῆς 'near my ship' suggests the direction of the movement. For ὁμοῦ with the gen. instead of the usual dat., cf. Xen. *Anab.* 4.6.24 πρὶν δὲ ὁμοῦ εἶναι τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀλλήλων (though some MSS have ἀλλήλοις). Cf. 256 μηδ' ὁμοῦ διηγήθ' πω with 254-6n., K-G 1.352-3. The (unmetrical) MS variant ἐγγὺς at the end of 1218 was probably intended to provide a preposition that regularly governs the gen., in place of ὁμοῦ. καὶ πάλαι: καί often precedes and emphasizes 'temporal adverbs denoting length of time' and other intensive and quantitative adverbs and adjectives (*GP* 318). ἥδη, often joined with other words of time (e.g. 1461-2 νῦν . . . ἥδη, *OC* 510 πάλαι . . . ἥδη), also emphasizes πάλαι, and with στείχων . . . ἥ suggests an action that would have begun in the past and be continuing in the present. Cf. K-G II.134-5. For καὶ πάλαι, cf. 966, *Ant.* 289.

1219–21 εἰ μὴ... ἐλεύσσομεν ‘if we did not see Odysseus on the move nearby and the offspring of Achilles coming hither toward us’. The Chorus distinguish between Od. moving in their general direction and Ne., their leader, coming directly toward them; they refer to Od. only by his name, but Ne. is, significantly, ‘the offspring of Achilles’ (Pucci 296). The contrast between the two is enhanced by the position of Ὀδυσσεύα at the beginning of 1220 and of Ἀχιλλέως at the end, and Ἀχιλλέως gains emphasis from the enjambment, τὸν... Ἀχιλλέως | γόνον; cf. 13–14 τὸ πᾶν | σόφισμα with n. For στείχων... στείχοντα, cf. 87–8 πράσσειν... πράσσειν, 265–7 ἀγρίαι... ἀγρίωι, 1268–9 λόγων... λόγοις, all rhetorically effective repetitions. For the not uncommon shift from first person plur. to first person sing., cf. 1393–4 ἡμεῖς δρῶμεν... δυνησόμεσθα... λέγω, *Ant.* 734 πόλις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀμέ χρὴ τάσσειν ἐρεῖ; see Bruhn 104–5, Moorhouse 8–9.

1222–60 Ne. enters by the *eisodos* on the audience’s left, carrying Phil.’s bow and arrows and trailed by Od., whose two-line question at 1222–3 is followed by stichomythia that continues to 1246. Then, at a moment of particular dramatic tension, there is a three-line sequence in which each character speaks one and a half lines, with *antilabē* in 1248. The stichomythia resumes and is ultimately punctuated by a three-line exchange marked by *antilabē* in successive lines (1254–5), followed by two lines spoken by Od., as he gives up trying to retrieve the bow and retreats from a physical confrontation with Ne. (1257–8), and two mocking lines addressed by Ne. to Od. (1259–60) as or after he departs. The formality of the stichomythia enhances the emotional intensity of the verbal exchange, especially when one character interrupts to complete (or suspend) the other’s syntax (cf. Mastronarde 1979: 54–9). The whole conversation reverses the effect of the stichomythia in the Prologue (100–22). There Od. was in command and instructed Ne., his subordinate, in how to deceive Phil. and gain control of the bow. Ne. asked questions, received guidance, and compromised his moral standards, in order to execute Od.’s σόφισμα. Here Ne. is no longer Od.’s subordinate but in control of the situation, while Od. follows, asks questions, and tries to prevent him from returning the bow. Ne. has decided, at some point between exiting at 1080 and re-entering at 1217, on this course of action to which he holds fast, despite Od.’s objections. Ne. rejects Od.’s implicit claim to represent ‘the whole army’ (1243, 1250, 1257; cf. 1143–5) and his instrumental emphasis on what is σοφόν; instead Ne. puts a premium on what is ‘right’ (δίκαια), as he tries to ‘undo’ or ‘take back’ the ‘shameful ἀμαρτία’ he committed when he deceived Phil. (1224, 1228, 1248–9). The frequent resolutions in Ne.’s trimeters (1226, 1228, 1232, 1238, 1249) reflect his emotion and the intensity of his determination to stand up to Od.

1222–3 οὐκ... ταχύς ‘would you not say what path you go on, turning back again, speeding with haste in this way?’ αὐ reinforces παλίντροπος, cf. 1190 ἐπήλυδες αὐθις, *OT* 430–1 αὐ πάλιν | ἄπορρος. For the cognate acc. κέλευθον ἐρπεις, cf. *Ant.* 1212–13 ἄρα δυστυχεστάτην | κέλευθον ἐρπω τῶν παρελθουσῶν ὁδῶν, Smyth §1567. οὐκ ἂν φράσειας is less peremptory

and more courteous than the fut. indic. οὐ φράσεις would be: cf. *Il.* 5.32-3 οὐκ ἄν δὴ Τρῶας μὲν ἑάσαιμεν καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς | μάρνασθ' ...; Contrast *Tr.* 1183 οὐ θᾶσσον οἴσεις ...; παλίντροπος | κέλευθον: cf. *Parm.* fr. 6.9 D-K παλίντροπος ... κέλευθος, referring (perhaps with a glance at Heraclit. fr. 51 D) Κ παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη ... τόξου καὶ λύρης) to the 'back-turning way' of those who 'drift both mute and blind in the same way, bewildered, tribes without judgement', because 'they believe that being and non-being are the same thing | and not the same thing' (*Parm.* 6.8-9). Here *Od.* may imply that Ne.'s 'turning back' on his path to go from the ship to Phil. instead of from Phil. to the ship is a sign of similar bewilderment and lack of judgement. παλίντροπος can suggest both a physical reversal of direction ('turning back') and a reversal of character. Cf. *LSJ s.v.* τρόπος 1, III.1-2, *Od.* 1.1 πολύτροπον, Goldhill 2012: 33.

1224 λύσων δσ' ἐξήμαρτον lit. 'to undo as many things as I did in error'. Cf. *Sappho* fr. 5.5 δσσα δὲ πρόσθ' ἀμβροτε πάντα λύσαι, *Ar. Ran.* 691 λύσαι τὰς πρότερον ἀμαρτίας.

1225 δεινόν γε refers to λύσων δσ' ἐξήμαρτον in the previous line, and the 'strangeness' is elucidated in ἡ δ' ἀμαρτία τίς ἦν. Cf. δεινόν γε at 755, *Aj.* 1127 (with a verb of saying), *El.* 341. γε is often exclamatory (rather than emphatic), when it follows an adj. or adv. (*GP* 127).

1226-8 ἦν σοι ... δόλοις ἑλῶνι the resolution at position 4 in 1226 πιθόμενος, like that at position 1 in 1228 ἀπαταῖσιν, suggests Ne.'s intensity and urgency. His sentence is still incomplete at the end of 1226 – there is no main verb – when *Od.* interrupts him in 1227 with an impatient question, ἐπράξας ἔργον ποῖον ...; Ne. responds in 1228, where ἑλῶν agrees with the subject of an understood ἡμαρτον (or, with Jebb, an understood ἐπράξα ἔργον οὐ πρέπον μοι). Cf. *Mastronarde* 1979: 58.

ὦν οὐ σοι πρέπον = τούτων ἃ οὐ σοι πρέπον ἦν πρᾶξαι. ἀπαταῖσιν ... δόλοις: these words suggest that Ne. not only wishes to undo his mistreatment of Phil., but condemns and rejects *Od.*'s values and way of life. Cf. 1136-7 ὄρων μὲν ἀσχερὰς ἀπατάς, | στυγνόν τε φῶτ' ἐχθοδοπόν.

1229-30 τὸν ποῖον; ... οὐδέν: *Od.*'s question followed by ὥμοι suggests his shock (real or pretended) at the realization that by 1228 ἄνδρα, Ne. means Phil. For μῶν, cf. 734n.; for νέον, 51-3n., 750-5n. Cf. *Eur. Med.* 37 δέδοικα δ' αὐτὴν μὴ τι βουλευσῇ νέον.

1230-3 τῶι ... νοεῖς: *Od.* interrupts Ne.'s syntax at the end of 1230 and 1232 with panicky questions. Cf. 1405-7, where Ne. interrupts Phil. with questions at the end of 1406 and the beginning of 1407. See *Mastronarde* 1979: 57n.16.

1230 τόκωι is an epic word denoting 'childbirth' and, by extension, 'offspring'. By using it, Ne. confers a special dignity on Phil., comparable to that of heroes from the epic past, with whom the word is often associated. Cf. *Tr.* 181 τόν ... Ἀλκμήνης τόκον, *OC* 69 Θησεύς ... , τοῦ πρὶν Αἰγέως τόκος. (At 614 the FM confers a similar dignity on *Od.* by referring to him as ὁ Λαέρτου τόκος.)

Elsewhere in the play Phil. is called, referred to, or refers to himself as τέκνον or παῖς(ς) Πολίαντος, and Od. refers to him once as Πολίαντος υἱόν.

1231 τί χρῆμα δράσεις 'what thing will you do'? χρῆμα in this and similar expressions is colloquial. Cf. 1265, Ar. *Vesp.* 834 τί ποτε τὸ χρῆμα, *Ran.* 795 τὸ χρῆμα ἔρ' ἔσται, Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 181, Stevens 1976: 22, Collard 2005: 361. ὡς μ' . . . φόβος 'how some fear has come over me'. The aor. tense suggests that this happened all of a sudden, and ὑπ- suggests that the fear took Od. unawares. Cf. *El.* 1112 ὡς μ' ὑπέρχεται φόβος. For τις similarly placed before the word it modifies, in an expression anticipating evil or misfortune, cf. 104, 519, 1039, *Aj.* 1163 ἔσται μεγάλης ἐριδός τις ἀγών.

1232 παρ' . . . τόξ: the resolutions at positions 4 and 6 in successive words reflect the urgency and emotion with which Ne. moves to return the bow. The resolution in ἔλαβον is particularly striking, since only 44 words with the metrical shape ∪× end at position 5 in Soph.'s seven surviving plays (9 in *Ph.*). Cf. Schein 1979: 81, Table xxxvii. τάδε implies a gesture by Ne. with the hand in which he is holding the bow. αὐθις πάλιν: cf. 127.

1233 τί λέξεις 'what do you mean to say'? This is the only Sophoklean instance of a Euripidean idiom expressing surprise or shock at something just seen or heard, e.g. Eur. *Med.* 1310, *Hec.* 1124. Cf. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 353, Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 1274. λέξεις (fut.) expresses pres. intention, cf. 441, 1204 ἐπεῖς. οὐ τί που . . . νοεῖς 'you don't intend to give anything back (do you)'? οὐ τί που in incredulous or hesitant questions is colloquial, cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1260, *Lys.* 354, *Ran.* 522, 526, Stevens 1945: 102. In tragedy, this idiom is mainly Euripidean (*GP* 492). δοῦναι is used for ἀποδοῦναι, cf. 48n.

1234 ἀσchrῶς . . . ἔχω 'yes (I will give them back), for I have obtained them shamefully and without justice'. With the bow in mind (and in his hand), Ne. changes Od.'s τι in the preceding line to αὐτά. He continues to focus on the ugly shameful of what he has done, cf. 1228, 1249, and in contrast to his suggestibility in the Prologue, now he cannot be convinced to do what is ἀσchrόν for the sake of 'salvation' and personal gain (cf. 108-16). For γάρ in stichomythia assenting to and giving a reason for something that was just said, cf. 756 with n. For the periphrasis consisting of ἔχω (as an auxiliary) plus the aor. part. with perfective meaning, cf. 1362 καὶ σοῦ δ' ἔγωγε θαυμάσας ἔχω τόδε, *Ant.* 192 ἀδελφὰ τῶνδε κηρύξας ἔχω. Cf. Smyth §1963, Moorhouse 206-7, K-G π.61-2.

1235 πρὸς . . . τόδε: θεῶν is scanned as one syllable (synizesis), cf. 195-6n. For a question with ironic δὴ expressing indignation, cf. 1071 λειφθή-σονται δὴ; The second part of the direct alternative question, which normally would be introduced by ἢ, is implicit in 1237 τίν' . . . λόγον. Cf. Smyth §2659, K-G π.532 Anm. 10. The resolution at position 4 in a three-syllable word ending at that position (∪∪∪4) is extremely rare and perhaps reflects Od.'s agitation, just as the resolution in 1314 πατέρα, the only other example of such a

resolution in the surviving plays of Aesch. and Soph., reflects Ne.'s awkwardness and hesitation.

1236 κερτόμησις is *hapax legomenon* in extant Greek literature and obviously coined with reference to 1235 κερτομών. Cf. Aesch. *PV* 977–8: Ερ. κλύω σ' ἐγὼ μεμνηνός· οὐ σμικρὰν νόσον. Πρ. νοσοῖμ' ἄν, εἰ νόσημα τοὺς ἐχθροὺς στυγεῖν. Especially (though not exclusively) in stichomythia, the periphrastic use of a -σις noun with ἔστιν can be emphatic (Long 1968: 67); even alone, -σις nouns can have a similar emphasis, e.g. 1406 προσωφέλησις, *El.* 527 τῶνδ' ἄρνησις οὐκ ἔνεστί μοι; cf. Long 1968: 65–6.

1238–9 δις... ἐβουλόμην: Ne. 'Do you want me to keep turning over the same words two and three times?' Od. 'I would wish not to be hearing (them) at all, even once.' ἀναπολεῖν/ἀναπολίζειν and, in Attic prose, ἐπαναπολεῖν mean literally 'to turn over the ground (i.e. 'plough') again', and figuratively 'to go over (the same ground) again', 'repeat'. Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 7.104–5 ταῦτ' ἀ τρις τετράκι τ' ἀπολεῖν | ἀπορία τελέθει 'to plough the same (ground) three and four times | goes nowhere'. Here, Ne. refers to the proverb δις καὶ τρις τὸ καλὸν ἀναπολεῖν, to which τὸ δὲ κακὸν οὐδ' ἅπαξ is sometimes added (Leutsch-Schneidewin II: 369.26). Cf. Pl. *Phileb.* 59e10–60a2 ἡ δὲ παροιμία δοκεῖ ἔχειν, τὸ καὶ δις καὶ τρις τό γε καλῶς ἔχον ἐπαναπολεῖν τῷ λόγῳ δεῖν, *Laws* 754c2–3, 956e7. ἀρχήν 'to begin with', 'in the first place' is adverbial; placed, as often, before a neg. statement, it signifies '(not) at all'. Cf. *Ant.* 92 ἀρχὴν δὲ θηρῶν οὐ πρέπει τάμηχανα, *El.* 439–41 ἀρχὴν... οὐκ ἂν ποθ'... ἐπέστεφε. See LSJ s.v. ἀρχή 1.1.c.

1240 εὖ νῦν ἐπίστω... λόγον: verbs of knowing are regularly followed by a 'supplementary' participle rather than an inf. Contrast this frank assertion of Ne.'s new intent with 241 οἶσθ' ἤδη τὸ πᾶν, which is disingenuous and misleading; cf. 389, 620. Some MSS have ἐπίστω followed by a colon; this may have given rise to the variant ἀκήκοας. Cf. *Aj.* 480 πάντ' ἀκήκοας.

1241 ἔστιν... ἔστιν 'there is someone, there is'. Od. means himself, though at 1243 he refers to the 'whole army of the Achaians'. For the emphatic repetition, cf. Eur. fr. 627 εἰσιν γὰρ εἰσί 'there are, there truly are'. **ὅς σε... τὸ δρᾶν:** after a verb of hindering, preventing, etc. such as κωλύσει, redundant μὴ before the inf. is common but can, as here, be omitted. After a neg. verb of hindering, preventing, etc., the inf. is preceded by μὴ οὐ or less often μὴ. Cf. 349 with 348–9n., Smyth §§2742, 2744. For τὸ δρᾶν, cf. 118 with n.

1242 τίς... τάδε 'who will be the one who will hinder me in this'? οὐπικωλύσων is crasis of ὁ and ἐπικωλύσων. Cf. *OT* 297 οὐξ ἐλέγξων, *Ant.* 261 ὁ κωλύσων.

1243 Ἀχαιῶν λαός: a touch of epic diction, by which Od. presents himself as a traditional epic hero. Cf. the formula λαός (-όν) Ἀχαιῶν, used of the Greek army 21x in the *Il.* Elsewhere in the play, the Greek army is (σύμπας) στρατός (387, 420, 582 1226, 1250, <1251a>, 1257, 1294, 1305, 1431). Cf. Kallinos 1.18 λαῶι γὰρ σύμπαντι, perhaps another formulaic phrase from traditional

oral epic, though it does not happen to appear in the Homeric corpus, the poems of Hesiod, or the fragments of archaic Greek epic. **ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐγώ** ‘and among them, I’. In Attic, the def. art. is idiomatic with **ἐν** and **ἐκ**, when a speaker includes himself or herself in a group that has just been specified. Cf. *OC* 741–2 πᾶς σε Καδμείων λεώς | καλεῖ δικάϊως, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μάλιστ’ ἐγώ.

1244 σοφός... σοφόν ‘although (you are) naturally clever, you say nothing clever’. Ne. pointedly turns a favourite word and idea of Od. against him, cf. 14, 77, 119, 431–2. Brunck’s σοφά for σοφόν, the reading of the MSS, could be correct, given 1245 σοφά, 1246 δίκαια, but sing. σοφόν at the end of the line after σοφός at the beginning is effective.

1245 δρασεῖσις cf. 1001n.

1246 ἀλλ’... τάδε ‘but if (I say or do) things (that are) just, these things are better (lit. “more powerful”) than (things that are) wise’. Ne. opposes δίκαια to σοφά (cf. 1251), unlike Od. at 77–82, who found cleverness wholly compatible with justice (or with the appearance of being just); cf. Od.’s declaration of pragmatic, amoral relativism at 1049–52.

1247–8 καὶ... ταῦτα ‘and (the things) which you got possession of by my plans, how is it right to let these things go again?’ Redundant ταῦτα, the grammatical antecedent of ἃ γ’, is not necessary for the sense, but gives clarity and emphasis to ἃ γ’... ἐμοῖς. Cf. 1398–9 ἃ δ’ ἤνισσάς μοι... | ... ταῦτά μοι πρᾶξον... 935 ἀλλ’ ὥς μεθήσων μήποθ’, ὥδ’ ὄρᾳ πάλιν with n., Campbell, *Essay* 74–5, §40. 2. For the relative followed by γε with causal force, cf. 663. Stung by Ne.’s belittling of τὰ σοφά and of himself as σοφός, Od. throws Ne.’s δίκαιον back at him in an irritated question that spills over the end of 1247, breaking the stichomythia. Od.’s heightened feeling is reflected in an unusual ‘split’ resolution, in which the two light syllables in place of a heavy syllable belong to separate words, ἃ γ’ and ἔλαβες (cf. 501 σὺ μ’ ἐλέησον, Eur. *IT* 728 ἃ δ’ ἐπὶ, *Ba.* 826 ἃ σὺ με). ἔλαβες pointedly echoes Ne.’s ἔλαβον in 1232, as Od. claims that since Ne. ‘got possession’ of the bow through Od.’s own plans, it is not right for him to return it against Od.’s wishes.

1248–9 τὴν... πειράσομαι Od. interrupts Ne. in the middle of the line (*antilabē*) with an emotionally urgent one-and-a-half line comment, which is similarly interrupted by Ne., whose one-and-a-half line response is rhetorically heightened by resolution and by the etymological figure ἀμαρτίαν... ἀμαρτῶν (cf. Smyth §1564). Cf. Eur. *Ion* 426 τὰς πρὶν ἀναλαβεῖν ἀμαρτίας, and for the sentiment, 1224 λύσων δὲ ἐξήμαρτον.

1251 ξὺν... δικάϊω ‘with right (on my side)’, cf. *Aj.* 765 σὺν θεῶι ‘with divine help’. **τὸν σὸν... (στρατόν)** ‘I do not fear that army of yours’ (i.e. the army with which you have just threatened me by asking if I do not fear it). σὸν is disparaging. Cf. *El.* 1110 οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν κληδόν’, Eur. *Hcl.* 284 τὸ σὸν γὰρ Ἀργος οὐ δέδοικ’ ἐγώ. The conjecture gives Ne.’s rejoinder more point than does the transmitted text with φόβον, which would, however, also be possible: ‘I

do not fear that terror of yours', i.e. 'that intimidating thing of which you speak'. For φόβος 'object or cause of terror', cf. *OT* 917 ἦν φόβους λέγει, *OC* 1651-2 ὡς δεινοῦ τινος | φόβου φανέντος, *LSJ* s.v. II.b.2.

1251 (...) φόβον: two considerations make it likely that a line has been omitted in the transmitted text: (1) most MSS assign 1252 and 1253 to Od., and some assign 1251a and 1252 to Ne. While the stichomythia could have been broken, at a moment of dramatic excitement, with one character speaking two consecutive lines, such dramatically motivated breaks in the pattern tend to come near the beginning or end of long passages of stichomythia, not, as here, in the middle (cf. Denniston on Eur. *El.* 651-2), and it is more likely that the pattern of one-line exchanges continues throughout 1224-53; (2) ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοι in 1252 suggests that one speaker is responding to a comment by another. Thus Hermann's proposal of a lacuna in the transmitted text is convincing, and Jackson's suggestion that φόβον was the final word of the missing line accounts for its presence in all MSS at the end of 1251a. The sequence is: 1251a Ne. 'With right on my side, I do not fear your army.' 1251b Od. '(Well, you ought to have) fear (of what we can do).' 1252 Ne. 'But I do not obey even ...'

1252 ἀλλ'... δρᾶν lit. 'but not even (the force of) your hand do I obey in respect to acting'. 'Your hand' = 'the force in your hand'; cf. 'lend me your ears' = 'lend me your power of hearing'. For the articular inf. τὸ δρᾶν, cf. 118 with n., 1241, *Anl.* 1105-6 καρδίας δ' ἐξίσταμαι | τὸ δρᾶν 'I withdraw from my heart's (desire) in respect to continuing to act (as I have been acting)', with Griffith's note.

1253 τᾶρα is crasis for τοι ἄρα 'so then'.

1254 ἔστω τὸ μέλλον 'let the thing about to happen, be'.

1254-8 χεῖρα... τιμωρήσεται: Od. breaks into the middle of 1254, threatening to draw his sword. The words κώπης ἐπιπαύουσιν gain emphasis from the enjambment and their position at the end of the sentence, as well as from Od.'s gesture of reaching for his sword-hilt. Ne., in turn, interrupts in the middle of 1256, saying that he too can be seen 'doing the same thing and not delaying further'. He is evidently placing his hand on his sword-hilt, when Od. thinks the better of a physical confrontation, tells Ne. that he will report what has happened (1258 τᾶδ') 'to the whole army, which will punish you', and exits, apparently heading for the ship (though when he enters again unexpectedly at 1293, he must be supposed to have been lurking nearby). The scene is almost comic in its combination of confrontational rhetoric, unconsummated swordplay, and Od.'s hasty retreat. Ne. comes into his own ethically, as he triumphs verbally and physically over Od.

1256 δρῶντα... ἔτι echoes the words of the False Merchant at 567, but now Ne. is in control of what is happening and no longer subject to Od.

1257 καίτοι σ' ἔασω 'and yet (i.e. despite my threat in 1254-5) I will leave you alone'. καίτοι is adversative, as if Od., of his own accord, has regained control of himself and changed his mind (Campbell on 1257, Jebb on 1257f., *GP* 558; cf. *LSJ* s.v. καίτοι II). Actually, though, he backs off because Ne. is about to draw his sword; καίτοι is meant to make his cowardice seem like prudence.

1259–60 ἔσωφρόνησας . . . πόδα ‘you’ve come to your senses; and if you are sensible in this way in the future, perhaps you could keep yourself out of trouble’ (lit. ‘keep your foot outside of wailing’). These words are addressed to Od. as or after he departs. ἔσωφρόνησας is ingressive aor., cf. 1099 φρονῆσαι with 1098–1100n.; φρονῆσις is ironic. For the simple φρονέω after the compound σωφρονέω, cf. 1382–3 καταισχύνῃ . . . αἰσχύνοιτ’ with n. ἔκτος κλαυμάτων ἔχεις πόδα is modelled on a familiar expression for keeping out of trouble(s) or harm’s way, e.g. Aesch. *PV* 263–4 ὅστις πημάτων ἔξω πόδα | ἔχει, Eur. *Hcl.* 109 καλὸν δέ γ’ ἔξω πραγμάτων ἔχειν πόδα, with the substitution of κλαύματα for ‘troubles’.

1261–92 Ne. calls for Phil. to come out of the cave, tries to overcome his mistrust, and eventually places the bow and arrows in his right hand, in a gesture mirroring the earlier transfer of the bow from Phil. to Ne. at 776 and recalling their handshake at 813 (cf. 942).

1261–2 σὺ . . . στέγας: Ne. turns to face the cave and courteously calls on Phil. to ‘come out’. Cf. Eur. *Hcl.* 642 ὦ μητὲρ ἐσθλοῦ παιδός, Ἀλκμήνην λέγω. Contrast Athena’s more abrupt and discourteous summoning of Ajax at *Aj.* 71–3 οὗτος σὲ . . . προσμολεῖν καλῶ | Αἴαντα φωνῶ· στείχε δωμάτων πάρος. ἀμείψας: the original sense of ἀμείβω is ‘change’ or ‘exchange’; in both act. and mid. it comes to mean ‘change location by crossing or passing’, and thus ‘entering or exiting’ a dwelling. Cf. *Tr.* 658–9 βασιῶνιν ἐστίαν | ἀμείψας, Eur. *El.* 750 ἄμειπον δώματ’ . . . τὰδε, LSJ *s.v.* ἀμείβω A.I.3.b, B.II.2. τὰσδε . . . στέγας: Ne. courteously dignifies Phil.’s cave by calling it a ‘roofed dwelling’, using the same word, στέγη, that Phil. himself uses at 286, 298, 1262, which suggests a product of human τέχνη rather than a natural rock-formation. For the ‘poetic’ plur. of a word meaning ‘house’, cf. the frequent use of δώματα and μέλαθρα, 1263 ἄντροις, *Ant.* 945 αὐλαῖς. Cf. Smyth §1006, Moorhouse 4.

1263 τίς . . . βοῆς lit. ‘what confused shouting is taking place again outside my cave?’ Cf. *OC* 1477–9 ἰδοὺ μάλ’ αὖ· | θίς· ἀμφίσταται διαπρύσιος ὄτοβος, Aesch. *Cho.* 885 τίνα βοήν ἴστης δόμοις; Phil. uses the word ἄντροις (cf. 1261–2n.), which denotes a natural cave and has more primitive associations than Ne.’s στέγας in 1262. Cf. *Od.* 9.216, etc. (the Kyklops’ cave), Aesch. *Eum.* 193 (a lion’s den), Eur. *Pho.* 232 (a serpent’s lair). When Phil. believes he has been abandoned without his bow to die in his ‘hollow of cavernous rock’ (1081–5), he implies that he has been reduced to a kind of savagery or animality analogous to that of these inhuman cave-dwellers.

1264–6 As Phil. emerges from the cave, he first sees the Chorus, whom he left there at 1217; then, when he has spoken 1264, he is surprised to catch sight of Ne. approaching, carrying the bow, because he assumed that he had gone back to the ship with Od. at 1080.

1264 τοῦ . . . ξένοι ‘in need of what, strangers’? In poetic texts, κεχρημένοι, perf. mid. of χρᾶμαι ‘use’, can mean ‘desiring’, ‘being in need of’. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 334 κοῦ πόνων κεχρήμεθα. See LSJ *s.v.* χρᾶω (B) C.1, 2. ξένοι: cf. 1163–4 with n.

1265 ὦμοι... χρῆμα 'Ah me, the thing is evil.' The phrase is colloquial (cf. 1231 with n.), and there may also be an acoustic play on 1264 κεχρημένοι. In Phil.'s mind, whatever Ne. has returned for can only be evil, at least for Phil. himself.

1265–6 μῶν... κακόν 'you aren't here, are you, bringing some big evil for me in addition to the evils (you already have brought me)?' Cf. LSJ s.v. πέμπω III.1. μέγας, especially in connection with spoken words, can suggest something powerful and dreadful (cf. *Aj.* 173 ὦ μεγάλα φάτις, *Ant.* 1350 μεγάλοι... λόγοι), and Phil. goes on to say (1268–9) that it is precisely Ne.'s words that he fears. μέγα... κακόν after 1265 κακόν is a rather bland description of the evil Phil. anticipates when he sees Ne., but cf. *Od.* 3.261 μέγ' ἐμήσατο ἔργον of Aigisthos' slaughter of Agamemnon, *Ap. Rhod.* 1.662 μέγα ἔργον of the Lemnian slaughter. Emendation is unnecessary, though Schneidewin's νέον (in its sinister sense, cf. 51–3n., 750–5n., 1229) and Bergk's νέα (agreeing with the MS variant κακά in 1266) have found favour with editors. Phil. uses the plur. πάρεστε, assuming that Ne. and Od. are still acting jointly against him; Ne.'s ἡμῶν in 1275, though it may be meant as a 'plural of modesty' (cf. Smyth §1008) referring only to himself, would seem to confirm this assumption.

1267–9 θάρσει... λόγοις: the deceptive and destructive power of Od.'s and Ne.'s persuasive language (and of language generally) is a central theme of the play, cf. 55 λόγοισιν... λέγων, 96–9, 1271–2, 1388.

1268 καὶ τὰ πρὶν γάρ 'for also previously'. γάρ can be placed third or fourth in its clause instead of coming second, when the preceding words cohere so closely together that they are felt as a single word (*GP* 95–6).

1269 καλῶν 'beautiful' – but also 'specious' – gains force from its position as the first word in the line after enjambment and by juxtaposition with κακῶς ἔπραξα.

1270 οὐκουν... πάλιν 'then is it not possible also to change my mind back again?' Phil. himself could imagine this possibility at 961–2 πρὶν μάθοιμ' εἰ καὶ πάλιν | γνῶμην μετοίσεις. Now he cannot do so.

1271–2 τοιοῦτος... λάθραι 'such you were in words also when you stole my bow, trustworthy, (but) secretly destructive'. πιστός (cf. 71) explains τοιοῦτος, cf. *OT* 435–6 ἡμεῖς τοιοῖδ' ἔφουμεν, ὥς μὲν σοὶ δοκεῖ, | μῶροι. χῶτε is crasis of καὶ ὅτε. The asyndeton πιστός, ἀτηρός is particularly forceful.

1273 ἀλλ'... νῦν 'but *not* in any respect (am I such) now'. The combination ἀλλ' οὐ τι μὴν (cf. *El.* 817) signals a new fact or consideration and is emphatically adversative.

1274 πότερα... καρτερεῖν: a supplementary participle *not in indirect discourse* can be used to complete the meaning of a verb signifying to begin, cease, endure, or grow weary of an action. Cf. Smyth §2098, K–G II.55.5, Moorhouse 260. Here the participle is in the dat., agreeing with σοι, which in turn is dependent on δέδοκται.

1275 ἡμῶν: cf. 1265–6n. παῦε... πέρα: Triklinios' παῦε for παῦσαι, the reading of the MSS, is metrically necessary and conforms to

colloquial Attic usage, in which παῦε, pres. imper., is intrans., unlike other forms of the verb, which are trans. Cf. Eur. *Ion* 522, Ar. *Ran.* 122, Pl. *Phdr.* 228e3, Collard 2005: 378. The *antilabē* reflects Phil.'s impatience, cf. 1277, 1280.

1276 μᾶτην . . . εἰρήσεται 'for whatever you do say (εἴπηις γε) will all be said in vain'. ἄν is crasis of ἄ ἄν.

1277 καὶ . . . λέγω 'yes (it has been decided) – know (this) – even more than I (can) say'. ἴσθ' is parenthetical, and καὶ πέρα γ' . . . ἢ λέγω goes with δέδοκται understood from Ne.'s comment earlier in the line. Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1082 = *Hec.* 667 καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ λέγω.

1279–80 εἰ . . . πέπαυμαι is a simple particular condition, and the use of the indicative in both protasis and apodosis implies that Ne. in fact thinks he is not speaking opportunely and therefore is stopping (cf. 1290 εἰ λέγεις). For κυρῶ with the participle, cf. 544n. For πρὸς καιρὸν = καιρίως, cf. *Aj.* 38, *Tr.* 59.

1280 πάντα . . . μᾶτην 'yes, (you are right to stop,) for you will say all (that you say) in vain'. In dialogue, γάρ frequently implies one speaker's assent to a statement just made by another speaker, even though the reason for the assent is not made explicit (*GP* 73–4, 76). This use of γάρ is slightly different from its use to indicate both assent and the reason for it. Cf. 756 with n. The repetition of μᾶτην (cf. 1276) is emphatic.

1281–3 οὐ γάρ ποτ' . . . ἀπεστέρηκας: εὖνουν is pred. adj., cf. Eur. *Or.* 267 τὸ θεῖον δυσμενὲς κεκτήμεθα; lit. 'do we possess divinity (as) hostile'? βίον 'life' plays on βίον 'bow'; Phil.'s bow is, in effect, his means of survival. Cf. 931. 933 with 931–3n. ἀπεστέρηκας takes the acc. of the thing stolen (cf. 931), and λαβὼν governs both the acc. and the gen. **δοσις γε:** both limitative and causal. The only other example in extant Soph. of the rel. indef. + γε is *OT* 1335 δῶι γε.

1283–4 καῖτα . . . γεγώς 'and then' (i.e. 'after what you have done to me') 'you will come and give me advice, (you,) born from the best father, who have become most hateful!' This exclamation could also be punctuated as a question, which might strengthen Phil.'s expression of angry incredulity. καῖτα is crasis of καὶ εἶτα. γεγώς, perf. participle of γίγνομαι, has the double sense 'born from' and 'become' (Kamerbeek 172).

1285–7 ὁλοισθ' . . . τάδε: at 961 Phil. had been reluctant to curse Ne. along with the Atreidai and Od. His shift to καὶ σύ at the end of the sentence, after Ἀτρεΐδαι μὲν and ἔπειτα δὲ | ὁ Λαρτίου παῖς, is particularly emphatic. Deictic τάδε implies that Ne. extends the bow toward Phil. for him to take hold of. This action and δέχου recall both 776, where Phil. entrusts the bow to Ne., and their handshake at 813. The grammatical and gestural simplicity of 1287 is striking.

1289 ἀπώμοσ' . . . σέβας 'I swear (that I am) not (deceiving you a second time), by the most high majesty of pure Zeus!' For ἀγνός used with a god's name, cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 653 Ζηνός . . . ἀγνοῦ, Pind. *Pyth.* 9.64 ἀγνόν Ἀπόλλων. Nevertheless many editors accept Wakefield's conjecture, ἀγνόν Ζηνός ὕπιστου σέβας, on the grounds that ἀγνός is more appropriate to σέβας than to Ζηνός

(cf. *OT* 830 θεῶν ἀγνὸν σέβας, Aesch. *Eum.* 885 ἀγνὸν . . . Πειθοῦς σέβας), and that ὑπιστος is a known epithet and cult title of Zeus. Yet the fact that ἀγνὸν modifies σέβας elsewhere and ὑπιστος, Ζεύς need not mean they must do so here. The chiasmus produced by the conjecture (adj. A, noun B, adj. B, noun A) is more elegant than the simple AABB found in the MSS, but straightforward simplicity, not elegance, is the point here, as in 1287, and the artificiality of Wakefield's chiasmus would be out of place. ἀπώμοσ' 'I swear (that I am) not . . .', cf. *OC* 317 φημί κάποφημι 'I say that it is and I say that it is not (*sc.* Ismene)'. Cf. Pucci 303. For ἀπόμνυμι governing the acc. of the gods by whom one swears, cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1232 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐθελήσεις ἀπομόσαι μοι τοὺς θεούς. ἀπώμοσ' is an example of the so-called 'tragic aorist', found most often in tragic dialogue, which indicates that the action expressed by the verb has already taken, or is now taking, place at the time the verb is spoken. Cf. 1314 ἦσθην, *Aj.* 536 ἐπήνεσ', 693 ἐφριξ', *Ant.* 1307 ἀνέπταν φόβῳ (lyric). In these and similar passages, the 'instantaneous' aspect of the aor. seems to express a sudden rush of emotion in response to something that has just been said or done. Cf. *GMT* §60, K–G 1.163–5, Moorhouse 195–6, Lloyd 1999: 24–45.

1290 ὦ . . . ἐτήτυμα: cf. Eur. *Ion* 1488 ὦ φίλτατ' εἶποῦσ', εἰ λέγεις ἐτήτυμα. εἰ with the indic. suggests that Phil. thinks Ne. is in fact speaking truthfully. Cf. 1279–80 εἰ . . . κυρῶ.

1291 τοῦργον παρέσται φανερόν: after Phil.'s comments about mistrusting Ne.'s words (1268–9, 1271–2), Ne. emphasizes that his *deed* will be 'manifest' for Phil. to see, as it were, with his own eyes. Cf. 1266 πάρεστε 'you are here' and the frequent use of the pres. participle of πάρεμι for vividness and to indicate physical presence, e.g. 373, *Aj.* 1156 ἄνδρ' ἐνουθέτει παρών, *El.* 300 ὁ κλεινὸς . . . νυμφίος παρών.

1291–2 ἀλλὰ . . . ὀπλων: Ne., in effect, urges Phil. to undo his earlier handing over of the bow, cf. 942–3 προσθεῖς τε χεῖρα δεξιάν, τὰ τόξα μου | ἱερὰ λαβὼν . . . ἔχει. See 1285–7n. ἀλλὰ introduces and strengthens Ne.'s exhortation, cf. 486, 950, *GP* 13–15. κράτει . . . ὀπλων 'be master of your weapons', i.e. take control of them physically (by grasping them in your right hand).

1293–1307 As Phil. reaches for the bow, Od. springs forth unexpectedly from his hiding place (cf. 1254–8n.) and tries to prevent the transfer (1293–4). At first Phil. cannot see him, but recognizes his voice (1295–6, cf. 976). As Od. approaches and threatens to have him taken to Troy by force (1296–8), Phil. aims an arrow at his enemy, but Ne. seizes or jostles his arm so that he cannot shoot (1300–2). Od. rushes off and is out of sight by the middle of 1302, ignobly ending one of the briefest appearances by any character in extant Attic tragedy – fewer than ten lines. (The only briefer appearance is Agamemnon's at Eur. *IA* 1621–6, which many scholars consider to be part of an interpolation.) The only other character in tragedy to run away when physically threatened is the Phrygian slave at Eur. *Or.* 1526, though many in comedy do so (Taplin 1971: 37). Od.'s brief appearance and discreditable flight mark the failure of his intrigue, in contrast

to his success in the Philoktetes plays of Aesch. and Eur. and to the expectations of Soph.'s audience, who might well have wondered at this point how the play could be harmonized with the traditional myth, according to which Phil. went to Troy with Od. and was instrumental in the sack of the city. Cf. Pucci 303; *Introd.*, p. 28.

1293 ἐγὼ . . . ἀπαυδῶ γ' 'but I say, "No"'! (i.e. "I forbid it"). For the force of ἀπ- in ἀπαυδῶ, cf. 1289 ἀπώμοσ'. For δέ . . . γε, when γε follows and emphasizes a verb, cf. 660, 1037 with n. At 974 Od. is in time to prevent Ne. from returning the bow, but here he is too late. ὥς . . . ξυνίστορες 'as the gods (are my) witnesses'. Cf. *Ant.* 542 Ἀιδης χοῖ κάτω ξυνίστορες, Eur. *Supp.* 1174 Ζεὺς δὲ ξυνίστωρ οἱ τ' ἐν οὐρανῷ θεοί.

1294 ὑπέρ τ': for the unusual placement of τε, which normally might be expected to come after Ἀτρειδῶν, cf. 185–6 ἐν τ' ὀδύναις ὁμοῦ λιμῶι τ' οἰκτρός, *OC* 33–4 τῆς ὑπέρ τ' ἑιοῦ | αὐτῆς θ' ὀρώσης.

1295 τέκνον: Phil. once again addresses Ne. with affection, now that he has returned the bow.

1295–6 μῶν . . . ἐπιηισθόμην: μῶν usually introduces a question to which a negative response is expected, cf. 734 with n. Phil. cannot believe that he is actually hearing Od. again, but now that he is once again in possession of his bow, he does not cry out in sorrow as he did at 976 and 978 (οἶμοι). Cf. Pucci 304.

1296 σάφ' ἴσθι: cf. 977 with 976–7n., 980, where Od. similarly confirms his identity.

1297–8 ὅς σ' . . . θέληι: the confident tone of Od.'s fut. more vivid condition may reflect his belief that he will be able to convey Phil. to Troy or may be a rhetorical ploy. For ἀποστέλω βίαι, cf. 983, 314–15n.

1299 ἀλλ' . . . χαίρων lit. 'but not in any respect rejoicing (will you send me off to the plain of Troy)', i.e. '(you will send me off . . .) not with impunity'. ἀλλ' οὐ (τι) χαίρων is formulaic in threats, when a verb in the fut. tense is expressed or implied. The threat is stronger when the verb must be understood, as here, from the previous speaker's words (cf. Eur. *Or.* 1592–3 Ὀρ. ἀρκέσω δ' ἐγὼ λέγων. | Με. ἀλλ' οὐ τι χαίρων . . .) than when the verb is expressed by the one making the threat (cf. *Ant.* 758–9 ἀλλ' οὐ . . . | χαίρων . . . δειννάσεις ἐμέ, *OT* 363 ἀλλ' οὐ τι χαίρων δὲς γε πημονὰς ἐρεῖς). Sometimes the threat is made with κλαίων instead of οὐ χαίρων as the circumstantial participle, e.g. *Ant.* 754 κλαίων φρενώσεις with Griffith's note; cf. 1260 κλαυμάτων, LSJ s.v. χαίρω iv.2, Smyth §2062a, Bruhn 151.

1299 ἦν . . . βέλος 'if this arrow is aimed straight', not 'if this arrow goes straight to its mark'. Phil. has taken the arrow in his hand and is fitting it to the bow, but has not yet released it (as 'goes straight to its mark' might imply), when Ne. prevents him from doing so.

1300–1 ἄ . . . τέκνον: for initial ἄ implying protest or reproof, cf. *OT* 1147 ἄ, μὴ κόλαζε . . . τόνδ', Aesch. *Ag.* 1087 ἄ, ποῖ ποτ' ἤγαγές με, Dodds on Eur. 810–12. The double negative μηδαμῶς, μὴ expresses the urgent intensity with which Ne. tells Phil. not to release the arrow; Phil.'s πρὸς θεῶν and his emotional

address to Ne. as φίλτατον τέκνον (both 'dearest child' and 'my child, if you [really] love me') reflect his urgent desire to kill Od. Cf. Eur. fr. 789d20, based on Dio Chrysostom's paraphrase of Eur. *Philoctetes*, where Od. himself urges Phil. not to shoot him: ἀλλ' ὦ πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίσχες ἀφείναι τὸ βέλος (D. Chr. *Or.* 59.7). The strong feelings of both Ne. and Phil. are reflected in the rough rhythm of 1300 and 1301, each with multiple, interior sense-breaks. μέθες με . . . χεῖρας: lit. 'release me, my hand', i.e. 'let go of my hand'. This construction with double acc. of the whole (person) and the part, where the part is in apposition to the whole (or perhaps an acc. of respect), occurs in poetry from Homer on, but is rare in prose. Cf. 823 with 821-5n., *Ant.* 319 σ' ἀνιᾷ τὰς φρένας, Smyth §985, Moorhouse 41. As often in stichomythia, one speaker repeats the same word used by the other speaker in the preceding line, but with a difference: 1300 μεθῆις 'release' means 'shoot', 1301 μέθες 'release' means 'let go of your grip (on my hand)'.

1302-3 τί μ' . . . ἐμοῖς 'why did you prevent me from killing with my bow a man who is (my) enemy and hated (by me)'? Here ἀφαιροῦμαι 'take away from', 'rob' is, in effect, a verb of hindering or preventing like κωλύω (cf. 1241n.) and is followed by redundant μή + inf. Cf. Eur. *Trö.* 1146 ἀφείλετ' αὐτὴν παῖδα μὴ δοῦναι τάφῳ, Smyth §2741, *GMT* §807, *LSJ* s.v. ἀφαιρέω π.3. πολέμιον | ἐχθρόν τ': the usual distinction between these words as referring to a public and a private enemy, respectively, is ignored: for Phil., Od. is an enemy in every way. Cf. 1323 πολέμιον δυσμενῇ θ' ἡγούμενος, with reference to Phil. hating anyone who gives him friendly advice. Phil.'s intense emotion is reflected by the divided line and the resolution at position 10, which is extremely rare (just ten occurrences in Soph.'s seven surviving plays, only two of which - 1302 and 1327 - involve a word with the metrical shape $\cup\cup\cup$ -¹² at the end of the line (cf. 1235n.).

1304 τοῦτ' . . . καλόν: Wakefield's transposition restores the word-order in which καλόν applies to both Ne. (ἐμοί) and Phil. (σοί). With the reading of most MSS, καλόν . . . σοί, καλόν would be felt only with ἐμοί. Presumably the correct order was lost in an attempt to clarify or explain the syntax of οὗτ' ἐμοί.

1305-7 ἀλλ' οὖν . . . θρασεῖς: ἀλλ' οὖν (often followed shortly afterward by emphatic γέ) is typically used in replies that (1) introduce a protest or objection to something that has just been said, or (2) implicitly reject a suggestion or comment, usually while making a more moderate one (*GP* 441-3). Here Phil. rejects Ne.'s comment, that to kill Od. would not be καλόν, with a disparaging remark about Od. and his fellow army leaders being cowards. 1306 κακοὺς is pred. adj. after ὄντας in the indirect discourse introduced by ἴσθι; it is illogically but effectively opposed to 1304 καλόν.

ψευδοκήρυκας: Phil. refers to Od.'s repeated implication that he represents and reports to the whole army (1226, 1243, 1257, 1294). In Attic tragedy heralds are sometimes portrayed negatively as using inflated but empty language in an arrogant manner, e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 872-951, Eur. *Supp.* 399-580.

ἐν . . . λόγοις: cf. 60 ἐν λιταῖς with ὅαν.

1308-1401 Now that Ne. has returned the bow to Phil., he attempts to persuade him to accompany him to Troy on the basis of what will be in *Phil.*'s best interests, not those of the Greek army. In this attempt at persuasion, Ne. recounts how Phil. received the snake bite that continues to torment him and tells him details of Helenos' prophecy that the False Merchant had not mentioned at 610-13. Phil. is torn between his loyalty to Ne. and his hatred of Od., the sons of Atreus, and the army, but in the end he refuses to go. The long speeches of Ne. and Phil. (34 and 28 lines), which follow their brief exchange in 1308-13, constitute virtually a formal debate. The subsequent series of balanced shorter exchanges (29 lines) ends only when Phil. tells Ne. to stop talking about Troy and leave him 'to suffer what [he] must suffer' (1397-1401).

1308 εἴν 'right', 'well'. εἴν is a colloquial expression, indicating that the speaker is ready to move on to a new point or, as here, a new topic. Cf. *Aj.* 101, *El.* 534. εἴν is always the first word of an iambic trimeter, except for Aesch. *Cho.* 719 (anapaestic dimeter), Eur. *Or.* 774 (trochaic tetrameter catalectic), and five occurrences *extra metrum* in trimeter contexts (Eur. *Med.* 386, *Tro.* 945, *IT* 467, *Ion* 275, *Pho.* 1615). Cf. Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 615.

1308-9 τὰ μὲν . . . ἐμέ 'well, you have the bow, and there is not (any cause) for which you might hold anger or blame against me'. Cf. 522-3, *OT* 698-9 διδασκον κάμ' . . . οὔτο ποτὲ | μῆνιν τοσύνδε πράγματος στήσας ἔχεις. Ne. begins with μὲν (given emphasis by δῆ), as if an antithetical δέ clause will follow immediately, in which he will say what he wants from Phil. He is, however, distracted by Phil.'s comment in 1310-13, which he answers in 1314-15, so the δέ clause begins only in the middle of 1315.

ἔχοις ἄν: a potential optative with ἄν in an indirect question introduced by a verb in a primary tense (here, οὐκ ἔσθ') retains its own mood and tense (Smyth §2677, *GMT* §681). ὀργήν . . . μέμψιν: Ne. employs a periphrasis consisting of ἔχω governing two abstract nouns as dir. obj., instead of using forms of ὀργίζομαι and μέμφομαι directly. Such periphrases with a -σις noun or a -σις noun in combination with another noun, can be particularly emphatic. Cf. *Ant.* 718 μετὰστασιν δίδου, *OT* 218 ἀλκὴν λάβοις ἄν κἀνακούφισιν κακῶν, 727 ψυχῆς πλάνημα κἀνακίνησις φρενῶν. See Long 1968: 34, 84-90.

1310-12 τὴν . . . Ἀχιλλέως 'the stock from which you grew, not from Sisyphos as a father but from Achilles'. For Ne.'s noble lineage, cf. 719, 874-5; for Od. as offspring of the base Sisyphos, cf. 384, 417. φύσις is used figuratively for a human γένος and gains emphasis from its placement at position 6 before δ' (quasi-middle caesura). Cf. 276, 101n. The first syllable of ἐβλαστες is metrically 'light', though normally in classical Greek poetry a syllable ending in a short vowel before βλ (or γλ) is 'heavy'. For a light syllable before forms of βλαστάνω or βλάστη, cf. *OT* 717, *El.* 440, *OC* 972, fr. 122, Eur. fr. 429.2; Dawe on *OT* 717 notes three other instances in tragic texts of a light syllable before βλ: Aesch. *Supp.* 761 βύβλου, Eur. fr. 697.1 ἀμφίβληττρα, fr. *adesp.* 455.2 ἐβλαψε.

1312–13 **ὅς... τεθνηκότων:** Phil.'s praise of Achilles recalls, and Soph. may have based it on, *Od.* 11.482–5 'No man, Achilles, | was more blessed than you in the past or will be in the future; | before, when you were alive, we honoured you equally to the gods, | we Argives, and now, being here, you have great power | over the dead'. **ἥκου' ἄριστα** 'heard the best things (said about him)', i.e. 'had the best reputation', was 'most glorious'. Cf. 607 with 606–8n.

τεθνηκότων depends both on an understood **ἥκου' ἄριστ'** supplied from the beginning of the line, and on **μετά** understood from the previous line.

1314–47 Ne. begins his attempt to persuade Phil. to come with him to Troy by briefly expressing pleasure at Phil.'s praise of Achilles and himself, before commenting more generally on human beings having to bear the fortunes given by the gods and on Phil.'s savage refusal to accept the advice of those who mean well (1316–23). Only then, with an antithetical **ὁμως δὲ λέξω** (1324), does the actual process of persuasion begin, with an account of the prophecy of Helenos concerning the imminent fall of the city (1337–42), and culminate in the recommendation that Phil. enjoy the **καλή... (ἐ)πρίκτησις** 'additional gain' of 'coming into healing hands', being 'judged the best of the Greeks', and winning the 'highest glory' (1344–7). Cf. Friis Johansen 1959: 116–17. At 192–200, Ne. had asserted that Phil.'s sufferings were of divine origin and part of an arrangement to keep Troy from falling, until the time at which it must be conquered by 'the unopposable arrows of the gods' (198). Now he accuses Phil. of himself wanting to prolong these sufferings, despite divine assurance (through Helenos) that the city's fall is imminent (1338–41). Ne. does not call Phil. unjust in opposing a divine ordinance, but implies that he would be self-defeating in not agreeing to what, for him, would be a 'fine additional gain'. As in the *parodos*, Ne. does not offer a coherent theodicy. Rather, he asserts the divine necessity that Troy 'must be taken within the present summer' (1340–1) as part of his effort to persuade Phil. to do as he (Ne.) wishes. Unlike in 192–200, Ne. explicitly cites the prophecy of Helenos – including details not mentioned at 610–13 by the FM – to enhance his friendly persuasion, but he was not present when Helenos spoke, and there is no indication of how he knows these details or if they are accurate (and the question of what might be accurate is of course unanswerable).

1314–16 **ἦσθην... ἄκουσον:** **ἦσθην** is 'tragic aor.', cf. 1289 with n. 1314 has several features that are rare in the surviving plays of Soph., perhaps reflecting the awkwardness and the tentativeness with which Ne. speaks (cf. 1235 with n., 1302 with 1302–3n.): (1) **πατέρα** includes one of only two examples in the Sophoklean corpus of resolution at position 4 in a word with the metrical shape ~~~ ending at that position; (2) the Doric form **ἄμὸν** (= **ἐμόν**), a conjecture of Triklinios on metrical grounds, occurs elsewhere in Soph.'s surviving plays only at *El.* 279, 588, 1496, each time in the phrase **πατέρα τὸν ἄμὸν** at the beginning of an iambic trimeter; (3) the double gen. with **τυχεῖν** is rare, cf. Xen. *An.* 5.7.33 **πάντων οἰόμεθα τεύξεσθαι ἐπαίνου** 'we think (we will) meet with praise from all'.

1316–20 ἀνθρώποισι...τινά ‘human beings must endure the fortunes given by the gods, but as many (human beings) as involve themselves in harm that is voluntary, as you (do) – it’s not right that anyone either pardon or pity them’. In the *kommos* the Chorus tell Phil. ‘with all good will’ (1164) that his sufferings are of divine origin (1096–7, 1116) and that he is wrong not to escape them, when given the chance (1098–1100, 1168). They do not, however, have the same kind of personal relationship with Phil. as Ne. does, the same knowledge of Helenos’ prophecy, or the authority that enables Ne. to speak as forcefully as he does. Ne. contrasts the random fortunes (τύχαις) that come from the gods (cf. *OC* 1540 τοῦκ θεοῦ παρόν) with the ‘voluntary (i.e. ‘self-inflicted’) harm’ (ἐκουσίοισιν...βλάβαις) to which men cling (ἔγκεινται): Phil. could not help being bitten by the serpent and left alone on the island to suffer for ten years, but to refuse the chance to leave the island, be healed, and win glory would involve additional, voluntary suffering on his part. On the contrast between τύχη and a lot or destiny brought about by the gods, cf. 1098–1100n. **ἐκουσίοισιν:** ἐκούσιος is here treated as an adj. of two endings (cf. Eur. *Supp.* 151, Thuc. 7.57–9, Pl. *Leg.* 861e3); it has separate masc. and fem. endings at *Tr.* 727, 1123, Thucyd. 8.27.3, Pl. *Rep.* 603c6. There is no separate fem. form of ἀ(ε)κούσιος in extant Greek literature, cf. Thucyd. 3.82.2 ἀκουσίους ἀνάγκας.

1321 σὺ δ’ ἡγρίωσαι ‘you have become savage’. At 226 Phil. calls himself ἀπηγριωμένον in relation to his external appearance, but here Ne. uses ἡγρίωσαι to describe Phil.’s inward disposition and way of relating to others. ἡγρίωσαι is both mid. and pass.: since Phil. has been suffering for ten years as a result of what was done to him, ‘[he] has been made savage’; at the same time, since (in Ne.’s view) Phil. is clinging to the harm he suffers (1318–19) and refusing to rejoin the Greeks at Troy, he has made himself savage.

1321–2 **ΚΟΥΤΕ...ΕἰΔΝ ΤΕ...** when a negative clause (with οὔτε or μήτε) is correlated with a positive clause (with τε), ‘the clause with τε expresses the contrary of the clause with οὔτε [or μήτε]’ (Jebb). Cf. 1363–4 with n., *El.* 350 οὔτε ξυνέρδεις τήν τε δρῶσαν ἐκτρέπεις, *Il.* 24.156 οὐτ’ αὐτὸς κτενέει ἀπὸ τ’ ἄλλους πάντας ἐρύξει. See K–G II.291–2, *GP* 508–9.

1322 εὐνοίαι: εὐνοιαί, a mark of ‘civilization’ as opposed to ‘wildness’, can describe an individual’s kindness or sociability in contrast to his or her becoming or being made ‘savage’. Cf. the opposition between θήρ and εὐνοίαν at *Tr.* 707–8. εὐνοιαί is a key element in the relationship between Phil. and the Chorus (cf. 1164 εὐνοίαι with 1163–4n.) and is even more important in the relationship between Phil. and Ne. (e.g. 1281 εὐνοῦν, 1351 εὐνοῦς, cf. 670 εὐεργετῶν). Cf. *El.* 233 ἄλλ’ οὖν εὐνοίαι γ’ αὐδῶ.

1323 πολέμιον δυσμενῇ θι: cf. 1302–3 πολέμιον | ἐχθρόν τ’.

1324 ὁμως ‘all the same’, i.e. even though it may result in your considering me ‘an enemy and hostile’. **Ζῆνα...καλῶ:** by calling on ‘Zeus who watches over oaths’, Ne. in effect puts himself on oath in an attempt to be more persuasive.

1325 γράφου... ἔσω 'write them for yourself within your mind', i.e. make them more permanent and easily remembered, like laws or sacred texts inscribed on stone or bronze, or at least like words written on wax-tablets. Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 450 τοιαῦτ'... ἐν φρεσὶ γράφου, *Tr.* 682-3 παρῆκα θεσμῶν οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἔσωιζόμεν, | χαλκῆς ὅπως δύσνιπτον ἐκ δέλτου γραφήν, Aesch. *PV* 789 ἦν ἐγγράφου σὺ μνήμοσιν δέλτοις φρενῶν.

1326-8 σὺ... ὄφης 'you are sick with this pain by divine fortune, since you approached the guardian of Chryse who guards the roofless sanctuary, the hidden, indwelling serpent'. ἄλγος is cognate acc. of the kind where the accus. substantive is of 'kindred meaning with the verb' (Smyth §1567); it compresses the sense ἔχεις τήνδε ἀλγεινὸν νόσον (Campbell). Cf. 1235 with n., 1302-3n.

θεῖας τύχης: cf. 1316-17, fr. 201f (from *Eriphyle*) πῶς οὖν μάχουμαι θνητὸς ὢν θεαίᾳ τύχῃ. τύχη usually suggests something that happens randomly, at least from a human viewpoint (cf. 546). When τύχη is called 'divine' or is said to have been sent by 'the gods' (cf. 1316-17) or by a particular god (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 371-2, *Her.* 1393), it is usually not random and the question arises whether it and the god(s) in question should be thought of as moral or amoral. Cf. 451-2 with n.

Χρύσης... φύλακος: cf. 194 with n.

ὄς... ὄφης: the language in which Ne. describes the snake that bit Phil. is used elsewhere of the sacred serpent dwelling in the Erechtheum, the temple of Athena Polias on the Athenian acropolis. This serpent, which represented the mythical, autochthonous King Erichthonios, was thought to guard the temple and the city. See Ar. *Lys.* 759 τὸν ὄφιν εἶδον τὸν οἰκουρὸν ποτε, Hdt. 8.41.2 ὄφιν μέγαν φύλακα... τῆς ἀκροπόλιος... ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ, Hesych. οἰκουρὸν ὄφιν· τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος φύλακα δράκοντα. Cf. 15n., 134n. The two resolutions in 1327, the second of which occurs at position 10, where resolution is extremely rare (cf. 1302-3n.), reflect the strangeness of what happened to Phil.

τὸν ἀκαλυφῆ... σηκόν: ἀκαλυφῆς (= ἀκάλυπτος) is found elsewhere only at Arist. *de An.* 422a1, where it describes the 'uncurtained' organ of smell in some animals. For the emphatic enjambment, with def. article in one line and noun in the next, cf. 13-14, 1220-1, 1346-7, 1355-6, 1376-7. For the noun coming first, with the definite article in the 'enjambed' position, cf. 1350-1.

1329-35 καὶ... φανῆσι lit. 'and know that cessation (i.e. a 'stop') will never find (τυχεῖν) this painful and sorrowful disease, while the same sun rises in this region and sets again in this one, until you yourself come voluntarily to the plain of Troy, and encountering the sons of Asklepios (who are) with us, you are soothed of this disease, and with this bow and along with me you become visible to all (as the one) having sacked the towers'. This long sentence consists of (1) an indirect statement introduced by ἴσθι, but with the acc. and inf. rather than the participle that is normal in indirect discourse after οἶδα (Smyth §§2106, 2139, *GMT* §687); (2) a temporal clause, ἕως ἄν... δύνῃ πάλιν, dependent on the indirect statement; (3) another, three-part temporal clause (πρὶν ἄν... μόλησις, καὶ... μαλαχθῆις... καὶ... πέρσας φανῆσι). παύλαν is subj. of τυχεῖν,

which in turn governs νόσου βαρείας. At 208 βαρεῖα is used of Phil.'s αὐδα
 323
 πρυσάνωρ in response to his disease; here the 'heavy' disease itself is associated
 with notions of pain and sorrow. Cf. 207–9n. It might seem more straightforward
 to take ἄν τυχεῖν as complementary to ἴσθι and παῦλαν as obj. of τυχεῖν ('Know
 that you will never meet with a cessation of this oppressive disease...'), but
 elsewhere τυγχάνω has as its acc. obj. only a neut. pron., a substantival adj.,
 or an articular inf. For μή ποτ' rather than οὐ ποτ' after ἴσθ' in Ne.'s confident
 assertion, cf. Smyth §2705i, §2716, *GMT* §685.

1330-1 ξως... αἴρηι... δύνῃ: ξως ἄν is used with the pres. subjunct. in (1) a clause expressing indefinite or future duration of time, or (2) a clause referring to customary or repeated action, e.g. a relative clause as protasis of a pres. gen. or fut. more vivid condition. Cf. 1000 ξως γ' ἄν ἦι μοι γῆς τόδ' αἰπεινὸν βᾶθρον, Smyth §2426, GMT §613.3, 5, Moorhouse 295. Here and at *Aj.* 1117 and *OC* 1361, the MSS have ὥς, but in these three passages ὥς has rightly been emended to ξως (pronounced as one syllable with synizesis), because ὥς ἄν with the subjunct. cannot express duration ('while', 'as long as'); ἔστω ἄν with the subjunct. would also be possible. See Jebb on 1330f., Moorhouse 296. This sentence has apparently the only instance of αἴρω/αἶρω used intransitively like ἀνέχω/ἀνίσχω. For the combination of ταῦτηι and τῇδε, cf. 841, 1434-5, 1437. As Ne. says these words, he points first to the east, then to the west.

1332-5 πρίν ἄν... μόληις... μαλαχθῇς... φανῇς: πρίν, with or without ἄν, is used with the aor. (or, rarely, the pres.) subjunct., after a negative main clause, to refer to an anticipated future action, to customary or repeated action, or to a general truth. The aor. tense indicates the end of the action (understood as a particular point of time). Cf. 917, 1409-10, Smyth §§2444-5, *GMT* §645, Moorhouse 298-9. For omitted ἄν, cf. 917 with Jebb's n., 764-5 ἔως ἀνῇ; with 763-6n., *GMT* §620. **ἐντυχῶνι**: ἐντυγχάνω normally takes the dat.; here, however, the gen., which denotes 'encountering' the sons of Asklepios (as the dat. might), also suggests 'obtaining aid from them', just as 320-1 σὺν τυχῶνι κακῶν | ἀνδρῶν denotes 'encountering' evil men and suggests 'obtaining evil' from them. Cf. 320-1n. **Ἀσκληπιδῶν** implies that both sons of Asklepios,

from them. Cf. 320–1n. Ἀσκληπιδῶν implies that both sons of Asclepius, Machaon and Podaleirios, will heal Phil. In the *Little Iliad*, *Argumentum* (Bernabé 74=West 2003: 120–1), Machaon alone does the healing, and in other versions of the story, either he or Podaleirios is responsible (cf. Gantz 1993: 638). Cf. 1437–41n. μαλαγθῆις takes the gen. of separation on the model of verbs such as ἀναλίσκειν, ἀναλίσκειν the anaphoric εὖν

1437-41n. **μαλαχθῆναι** takes the gen. of separation on the model of **ἐξύν** denoting 'cease (from)'; cf. Smyth §1392. **ἐξύν . . . ἑμοί**: the anaphoric **ἐξύν** phrases are parallel in form, but the first dat. is instrumental (i.e. dat. of means), the second, comitative (i.e. dat. of accompaniment). At 114-15 Ne. is surprised to learn from Od. that he alone would not be **ὁ πέρσων**, but now he has accepted this destiny (cf. 1448). **πέρσας φανῆναι** suggests the brilliant light of glory in which he is to be seen. Cf. 611-12, 1428.

¹³³⁶ ὡς . . . φράσω 'how I know that these things hold in this way, I will (be the one to) tell (you)'. ἐγὼ is emphatic.

1337 ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔστιν . . . ἀλούς 'for there is a man with us (i.e. 'we have a man (in our camp)'), having been taken prisoner from Troy'; ἡμῖν is dat. of possession. (With ἔστιν (enclitic), the reading of some MSS, the sense would be, 'a man has been taken by us', and ἡμῖν would be dat. of agent with the perf. pass.) For γὰρ, cf. 1049–53n.

1338 ἀριστόμαντις for the formation (ἀριστος + μάντις), cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1241 ἀληθόμαντιν, Pind. *Nem.* 1.61 ὀρθόμαντιν.

1339–42 ταῦτα and τοῖσδ' must refer to Phil. 'coming willingly to the plain of Troy' to be cured by the Asklepidai and 'sacking the city with his bow, along with [Ne.]' (1332–5). τᾶδε must include the sack of Troy within the present summer (1340–1). κτείνειν is expegetical inf., after δίδωσι, cf. 619 τέμνειν. Ne.'s account of the prophecy differs significantly from that of the FM, who reported that Helenos told the Greeks they would not sack Troy, unless 'they bring Phil. from this island on which he now dwells, having persuaded him by speech' (611–13). It is impossible for an audience or reader to relate either version of this prophecy to Helenos' 'actual' words: the FM and Ne. attribute to Helenos what each thinks will be effective in inducing Phil. to join the Greek army and help sack the city, and both versions of the prophecy differ from the more extended and authoritative words of Her. at 1423–33, cf. 1418–44n. Cf. the prophecy reported by Ismene at *OC* 603–5, which 'interprets' what she says at 402 and 411. Soph. typically offers information about prophecies piecemeal, while leaving space for different reactions. Cf. 603–21n.

1344 καλὴ . . . ἐπὶ κτήσις 'for the additional gain (for you will be) fine', i.e. the gain in addition to leaving Lemnos.

1344–6 'that (you), having been judged the single best (man) of the Greeks, on the one hand come into healing hands, then, having taken Troy, (the cause) of much groaning, that (you) get the highest glory'. ἔνα strengthens the superlative ἀριστον, heightening the supremacy of Phil. over the rest of the army; cf. Solon 11.5 εἰς . . . ἕκαστος, LSJ s.v. εἰς, μία, ἐν 1.b. τοῦτο μὲν and εἶτα are correlated, cf. *El.* 261–2 πρῶτα μὲν . . . εἶτα, *Ant.* 61–3 τοῦτο μὲν . . . ἔπειτα δέ.

1347 κλέος ὑπέρτατον: Ne. ends with the seductive prospect of heroic glory; cf. Her.'s assurance that Phil. will 'make [his] life glorious' (εὐκλεᾶ θέσθαι βίον) after and as a result of his 'toil' on Lemnos (1422, cf. 1421–2n.). Such glory would, in effect, reverse 'the glory of my evils' (251) with which Phil. expects Ne. to be familiar when they first meet.

1348–72 This long *rhēsis*, in which Phil. rejects Ne.'s appeal, has two main parts: (1) 1348–61, in which Phil. does not respond to Ne. directly but explains in a series of emotional apostrophes and rhetorical questions why he cannot go to Troy and expose himself again to those who have destroyed him; (2) 1362–72, in which Phil. addresses Ne. directly and (a) asks, with amazement (1362), how he can think of allying himself again with those who have treated him outrageously, (b) recommends that he go home and 'leave evil men to perish evilly' (1369), and (c) urges him to live up to his promise to bring Phil. home,

for which he would earn the gratitude of Phil. himself and his father and avoid a reputation (1371–2 κοῦ... δόξεις) for helping evil men and being like them. Despite the delib. subjunct. in 1350–2, Phil. is not so much debating whether or not to yield to Ne.'s plea, as stating why it is impossible for him to do so. Cf. Medda 1983: 146–8. Phil.'s stubborn refusal to yield even to 'his rescue and the divine order of things... to adapt himself to his own salvation' (Reinhardt 1979: 190), is a triumph, even though it is grounded in a commitment to despair and death (Pucci 311). He rejects the traditional κλέος that Ne. promises him (1347), and ends with a *de facto* affirmation of different heroic values, χάρις (1370) and, though he does not use the word here, φιλία. Cf. Knox 1964: 137–9, Schmidt 1973: 233–5, Winnington-Ingram 1980: 295–7, Pucci 310–13.

1348 ὦ... αἰών: for a noun with ὦ in the nom. instead of the voc., cf. 254, 1185, 1213, 1380, 1402, 1445–6. αἰών is a personification of life as a 'lifetime' that is born with but exists independently of the individual. Cf. 179 οἷς μὴ μέτριος αἰών, Aesch. *Ag.* 107 σύμφυτος αἰών, *Aj.* 643–5 ἄταν, | ἄν οὐπω τις ἔθρεπεν | αἰών Αἰακιδᾶν.

1348–9 τί... μολεῖν; 'why, why then do you keep me above (ground), seeing (sc. the light of the sun)' – i.e. 'living' – and not send me off to go to (the house of) Hades'? Phil. says, in effect, that his life does not allow him the satisfaction of dying (Pucci 311). For the epexegetical inf. μολεῖν, cf. Hdt. 1.194.2 τὸ πλοῖον... ἀπιέσι κατὰ τὸν ποταμὸν φέρεσθαι. The anaphora (τί... τί), the resolution of the heavy syllable at position 6, and emphatic δῆτα (used when a speaker 'echoes or endorses his own words', *GP* 277) together express the intensity of Phil.'s emotions, cf. 759–60. For ἄνω 'above (ground)', referring to the place of the living, cf. *Ant.* 1068 τῶν ἄνω, *El.* 1167 ἡνίκ' ἦσθ' ἄνω. For βλέποντα 'seeing', 'being alive' without a direct obj., cf. 883, Aesch. *Ag.* 677 ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα. The idiom derives from the epic formula ὄρᾶν φῶς ἡελίοιο and similar expressions, e.g. *Il.* 24.558, *Od.* 4.540 = 10.498; cf. Eur. *Alc.* 18 μηκέτ' εἰσορᾶν φῶς.

1350–2 οἱμοι... δῆτ': δράσω, ἀπιστήσω, and εἰκάθω are delib. subjunct. As soon as Phil. asks himself these questions, he answers them with two additional, rhetorical questions (1354–7) that, in effect, dismiss his momentary wavering. λόγοις | τοῖς τοῦδ' gains added emphasis from the enjambment, and the position of the def. article following its noun. These λόγοι stand in contrast to those spoken earlier by Ne. (cf. 1267–80), which seemed to be still the words of Od. ἄλλ'... δῆτ': like other Sophoklean heroes, Phil. asks himself if he should yield but refuses to do so. He internalizes, as it were, the kind of appeal often made to these heroes, with εἴκω and related words, to yield, give way, moderate their passions, retreat from their absolute commitments. For the aor. formation εἰκαθεῖν, not found in Aesch. or Eur., see, e.g., *Ant.* 1096, *Tr.* 1177; cf. Knox 1964: 15–17.

1353 εἰς φῶς 'into the public gaze', cf. 580–1 λέγειν | εἰς φῶς 'to speak publicly' (i.e. 'openly'), Xen. *Ages.* 9.1 νομίζων τὸ φῶς κόσμον παρέχειν 'thinking that the

public gaze produces (good) order'.
'addressed'.

προσήγορος: both 'addressing' and

1354 ὦ... κύκλοι: for κύκλοι 'eyes', cf. *OT* 1270 ἔπαισεν ἄρθρα τῶν αὐτοῦ κύκλων, *OC* 704–5 ὁ γὰρ αἰὲν ὁρῶν κύκλος | λεύσσει νιν... Διός. Σ mistakenly glosses κύκλοι τὰ πάντ' ἰδόντες as τὰ περὶ ἐμὲ πάθη εἰδότες ἐνιαυτοὶ 'years knowing the sufferings around me', apparently taking κύκλοι to mean the annual 'cycles' or 'orbits' of the heavenly bodies. Cf. 1004 ὦ χεῖρες, 786, 1188 ὦ πούς.

1355–7 ταῦτ'... Λαερτίου: Phil.'s overriding consideration is shame, though he does not use the word. His rhetorical questions in 1354–7 imply, 'How can I expose myself as so powerless, in my own eyes and the eyes of others, that I associate with and assist the men who destroyed me (when, if I were able, I should be trying to destroy them)?' For the association of powerlessness and shame, cf. Williams 1993: 220–2. ταῦτ' at the beginning

of the line and the sentence is emphatic and anticipates 1355–6 τοῖσιν... παισίν. ἐξανασχῆσθαι: the prefix ἐξ- suggests that Phil.'s eyes will be strained to an extreme point of endurance by what they see.

1356–7 ἀπώλεσαν... πανώλει: the repeated sound -ωλ- strengthens the association of the sons of Atreus with the son of Laertes as those who have 'destroyed' Phil. Cf. 314–16.

1358–61 οὐ... κακά: these lines further explain (cf. 1358 γάρ) why Phil. cannot again associate with the sons of Atreus and Od. οὐ... δάκνει 'for the pain of past events does not sting me'. For the aor. of παρέρχομαι in a temporal sense ('bygone', 'past'), cf. *Tr.* 69 τὸν μὲν παρελθόντ' ἄροτον 'the past ploughing season', *OC* 1397 ταῖς παρελθούσαις ὁδοῖς ('your) past wanderings'. Of course, the pain of past events does 'sting' Phil. both literally and figuratively, so perhaps τοσοῦτον should be taken with οὐ... δάκνει ('does not sting me so much'). The figurative use of δάκνω is common in Soph. (cf. 378, *Aj.* 1119, *Ant.* 317), but the reality of the snakebite also gives Phil.'s words literal force.

1359–60 ἄλλ'... προλεύσσειν 'but I seem to foresee the sort of things I still must suffer from these men'. The relative clause οἷα... ἔτι precedes δοκῶ προλεύσσειν on which it depends. Cf. 70–1 ὡς δ' ἔστ'... |... ἔκμαθε. προλεύσσειν is *hapax legomenon* in surviving Greek literature. ἔτι is pleonastic, and hence emphatic, cf. 1339.

1360–1 οἷς... κακά 'for (those men) for whom the mind has become the mother of evils, (the mind) teaches (them) all the other evils (that follow in the future)', i.e. the evil actions that come later. For the double acc. with παιδεύει (τᾶλλα... κακά and αὐτούς understood from οἷς), cf. Antiphon 3.2.3 ταῦτα παιδεύων τὸν υἱόν, Aeschin. 3.148 παιδείαν αὐτούς ἐπαίδευσαν. For ὁ ἄλλος, οἱ ἄλλοι = 'the rest', 'all the others' with reference to the future, see LSJ *s.v.* ἄλλος 11.6. For the figurative use of μήτηρ, cf. *Aj.* 173–4 ὦ | μᾶτερ αἰσχύνas ἑμᾶς, Aesch. *Sept.* 224–5 πειθαρχία γάρ ἐστι τῆς εὐπραξίας | μήτηρ. Some editors find these lines difficult as transmitted and accept Dobree's κακοὺς ('the mind teaches them to be evil in all else').

1362 καὶ σοῦ . . . τόδε ‘and I have been wondering at this in *you* (*sc.* that you advise me to go to Troy, when the Greeks have treated you so outrageously)’. The periphrastic θαυμάσας ἔχω is more emphatic than τεθαύμακα would be. The combination of particles καὶ . . . δέ (or καὶ δέ) ‘denote[s] that something is added’ (καί), which ‘is distinct from what precedes’ (δέ) (*GP* 199 with n. 1); in this case, what is added is that it is *you* who are the cause of my wonder. καὶ . . . δέ occurs in Homer and elsewhere in tragedy, but this is the only example in Soph.; the idiom is far more common in prose than poetry, e.g. Thuc. 2.36.1, Pl. *Prot.* 331b2–3. Cf. *GP* 199–203. σοῦ is emphatic as the obj. of θαυμάσας ἔχω, not because καὶ means ‘also’.

1363–4 χρῆν . . . ἀπείργειν ‘for you yourself should never go to Troy, and you should prevent me (from going)’. For impf. indic. χρῆν without ἄν and followed by a complementary inf., cf. 418 ἔδει with n. μήτε . . . τῖ: cf. 1321–2 with n.

1364 οἱ γέ σου καθύβρισαν: by a so-called ‘sense construction’, οἱ γε refers back to Τροίαν = ‘the Greeks at Troy’. For the gen. of the person to whom outrage is done, cf. *OC* 960 τοῦ καθυβρίζειν δοκεῖς; Verbs compounded with κατα- ‘against’ often take the gen., but elsewhere καθυβρίζω takes the acc.

1365 πατρός . . . συλῶντες ‘stripping (from you) (your) father’s special gift of honour’, i.e. the armour given to Achilles by Hephaistos. Cf. 399–402 ὅτε τὰ πατρία τεύχεα παρεδίδοσαν . . . σέβας ὑπέρτατον, 412–13 οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε | . . . ταῦτ’ ἐσυλήθην ἐγώ. συλάω normally means ‘to strip off a fallen warrior’s armour and carry it away as booty’, so συλῶντες suggests that the Greeks showed further disrespect to Ne. by treating him as if he were a defeated enemy, a corpse from which to strip a γέρας (which is analogous to the way in which they treat Phil.). The image is effective, if somewhat forced, as the arms had not yet been given to Ne.

1365–65b οἱ . . . ἔκριναν: these lines are in all the MSS but must be spurious: at 410–11, when Phil. expresses surprise that Ajax allowed the Greeks to rob Ne. of his father’s arms, Ne. tells Phil. that Ajax ‘was (then) no longer living’, but says nothing about the contest of the arms between Ajax and Od. Thus Phil. could not know this story, which in any case is irrelevant to, if not incompatible with, the dramatic action of the play. Perhaps the interpolation was motivated by a sense that an allusion to the contest of arms was fitting in a play that referred to the death of Ajax and (even in a lie) to Odysseus’ gaining possession of the arms.

1365b–1366 εἴτα . . . τόδε ‘then will *you* go to be an ally for these men, and are you trying to force this on *me*, too?’ σύ is particularly emphatic by its position at the end of the line; its juxtaposition with τοῖσδε effectively conveys Phil.’s shock that Ne. would help the very men who have victimized him. The conjecture κᾶμ, crasis of καὶ ἐμ(έ), restores the corresponding emphasis on ‘me’. Phil. still believes Ne.’s story of having been robbed of his armour, and Ne. does not correct him. If he were to do so, he would expose himself as even more

deeply complicit with the sons of Atreus and Od. in the intrigue against Phil. than Phil. at this point realizes. As a result of Ne.'s silence, his supposed return to his inborn nature and his solidarity with Phil. rest on, or at least conceal, a lie. Cf. Pucci 314-15, *Introd.*, 24. For the fut. part. of purpose with εἶμι, cf. *Tr.* 83 οὐκ εἴ ξυνέρξων, *Il.* 3.383 αὐτῇ... Ἑλένην καλέουσ' ἦε. For the 'conative' pres. ἀναγκάζεις, expressing the attempt to compel Phil., cf. *Ant.* 318 τί δὲ βυθμίζεις τὴν ἐμὴν λύπην ὅπου 'why are you trying to define where my pain (is)'? Cf. Smyth §1878, Moorhouse 182-3. The conative force of a verb, which implies that the action denoted by the verb has not been completed, must be inferred from the context; this verbal nuance is less common with the pres. than with the imperf., where it expresses an action attempted in the past; cf. Smyth §1895 Moorhouse 190-1.

1367 μὴ δῆτα 'don't (try to force me)'! For μὴ δῆτα in 'passionate negative commands or wishes' (*GP* 276), cf. 762, *Aj.* 111 μὴ δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ᾧδὲ γ' αἰκίστη.

1367-8 ἀλλ'... οἴκους: Ne. never swore to take Phil. home to Malis, as Phil. claims here and at 941 and 1398-9. Phil. may be conflating in his own mind Ne.'s promise to stay with him while he sleeps off his paroxysm, when he takes Phil.'s right hand in his own in a formal gesture of friendship (813), with Ne.'s earlier, equivocally phrased agreement to take him where he wants to go (526-9). In the end, however, Ne. is persuaded to act on this supposed promise, cf. 1402-8n.

1369 ἔα... κακοὺς 'let these evil men perish evilly' - a powerful line marked by middle caesura (cf. 101 with n., 1064) and by paronomasia of the cognate adv. and adj., κακῶς... κακοὺς (cf. 166 συμγερόν συμγερόως, *Tr.* 613 καινῶι καινόν, *OT* 261 κοινῶν... κοίν'). Such paronomasia is found elsewhere in curses or bad wishes, e.g. fr. 764.1 (from an unknown play) <κακῇ> κακῶς σὺ πρὸς θεῶν ὀλουμένη, Eur. *Trö.* 1055-6 κακῶς | κακῇ θανεῖται, Men. *Dys.* 926-7 κακόν δὲ | κακῶς (σ') ἅπαντες ἀπολέσειαν οἱ θεοί. Here, it suggests Phil.'s excitement at the possibility that he may finally see something evil destroyed (cf. 446).

1370-1 χοῦτω... πατρός: i.e. both Phil. and his father will be grateful. (Phil. clearly thinks of his father as alive, cf. 1210 with n.) There is no need to analyse διπλὴν μὲν ἐξ ἐμοῦ... χάριν, | διπλὴν δὲ πατρός into two reasons why each man will be grateful. Cf. *Tr.* 618-19 ἔπειθ' ὅπως ἂν ἡ χάρις κείνου τέ σοι | κάμου ξυνελθοῦς' ἐξ ἀπλῆς διπλῇ φανῇ 'next, (take care) that double instead of single thanks will be manifest coming to you jointly from that man and from me'. The emphatic repetition of διπλὴν (*epanaphora*) mirrors Od.'s promise to Ne. in the Prologue that if he agrees to deceive Phil., he will win two prizes: to be called σοφός and ἀγαθός (117-19).

1371-2 κοῦ... πεφυκέναι 'and helping evil men, you will not seem to be naturally similar to evil men'. Phil. ends effectively with an appeal to the φύσις of which Ne. is so proud (cf. 79 with n., 88-9, 902-3) and which Phil. himself admires (cf. 874-5, 1310-12).

1373–1401 After their long speeches, the exchange between Ne. and Phil. modulates (1373–9) into stichomythia (1380–92) and concludes with Ne.’s four-line comment at 1393–6 followed by Phil.’s five-line response (1397–1401). The two remain at an impasse, until Ne. finally says that since he can’t persuade Phil. to leave with him, it would be best if he stopped trying and Phil. continued to live (on the island) as before, ‘without salvation’ (1395–6). Phil. responds, abruptly, that Ne. should leave him ‘to suffer what I must suffer’ (1397), but then calls on him to live up to his promise and convey him home (cf. 1367–8 with n.), with no further mention of Troy (1400–1).

1373 λέγεις μὲν εἰκότ’ Ne. has no way to deny or challenge what Phil. says in 1362–72 about Ne.’s supposed grievance against the Atreidai, without admitting that he is more deeply implicated in Od.’s intrigue than he admitted, when he told Phil. that he must come to Troy (915–16, 921–2, 925–6) and later tried to persuade him to do so (1329–47).

1373–5 ἄλλ’... χθονός ‘I want you to trust the gods and my words and to sail away from this land with me who am your friend’. For τοῦδε referring to the speaker, cf. 1036 with n. φίλον is pred. adj. and strongly emphatic by its position at the beginning of 1375. Ne. wants Phil. to yield on the basis of trust in the gods, whose goodness Phil. has already called into question (447–52), and trust in Ne.’s words, by which he has already been hurt (1268–9).

1376–7 ἦ... ποδί: Phil.’s question supplies ἐκπλεῖν from the previous line: ‘(to sail away) to the plain of Troy...?’ τὸν... υἱόν gains emphasis by enjambment, with the definite article in one line and the noun in the next; cf. 13–14 with n., 1220–1, 1327–8, 1346–7, 1355–6. τῷδε... ποδί ‘along with this wretched foot (of mine)’. For the dat. of ‘accompanying (circumstance)’, cf. Smyth §1527, Moorhouse 90–2.

1378–9 πρὸς... νόσου lit. ‘no, rather to those who will make you and this suppurating way (in which) you walk, cease from pain and save (you) from (your) disease’. μὲν οὖν, in the give and take of dialogue, is corrective (‘no, on the contrary’, ‘no, rather’); cf. *OT* 705 μάντιν μὲν οὖν κακοῦργον εἰσπύμπας, *El.* 1503–4 μὴ μὲν οὖν καθ’ ἡδονὴν | θάνηις, *GP* 475. ἔμπυσον, a medical term occurring only here in extant Greek poetry, gives a vivid image of pus discharging from Phil.’s abscessed foot as he limps along, step after step (βάσιιν). It brings out even more clearly and strongly what Phil.’s suffering and struggling to survive have involved, ‘where he was himself his own neighbour, not having (the power of) walking (βάσιιν)’ (691, cf. 289–92). κάποσώσοντας looks forward to Phil.’s eventual salvation, when he finally is able to ‘support [his] walking (βάσιιν) against [Ne.’s]’ (1403).

1380 ὦ... αἰνέσας lit. ‘ο, you who have advised a terrible advice’. Cf. 1348n. The etymological figure αἶνον αἰνέσας is emphatic. Cf. 1248–9 ἀμαρτίαν... ἀμαρτῶν.

1381 ἃ... τελούμενα ‘those things which I see are best for both you and me, being accomplished’. τελούμενα is pres. pass. part. The same form could

be fut., but 'there is no clear example in Attic of τελοῦμαι as fut. pass., while τελούμενος as pres. pass. part. is frequent (e.g. *OT* 797, *El.* 1344)' (Jebb). Ne.'s response supplies φημί (from 1380 φήις), governing ἄ = ταῦτα ἄ.

1383 πῶς... φίλους; 'how should anyone be ashamed (while) benefiting (his) friends'? Buttman's emendation is necessary, since 1383 assumes that 1382 refers to a benefit given rather than one received. ὠφελούμενος, if understood as mid., would give an inappropriate sense of Ne. benefiting himself and make his comment too similar, in its emphasis on 'gain', to Od.'s δῖον τι δρᾷς εἰς κέρδος, οὐκ ὀκνεῖν πρέπει (111). Similarly, ὠφελούμενος could not be taken as pass., because it is a question of Ne. conferring a benefit, not receiving one.

αἰσχύνοιτ': for the simple verb following the compound (1382 καταισχύνει), cf. 1259 ἐσωφρόνησας... φρονῆις, K-G II.568.

1384 λέγεις... τόδε; 'do you mean this 'benefit' (is) for the sons of Atreus or in my case'? Phil. refers specifically to Ne.'s ὠφελῶν in the previous line.

1385 σοί που... ὦν ('I mean) for *you*, without a doubt, since I am your *friend*; and what I say (i.e. the word ὠφελῶν) is such', i.e. is friendly. λέγω is understood from λέγεις in the preceding line.

1386 πῶς... θέλεις 'how (are you my friend), (you) who wish to give me up to (my) enemies'? For the relative, with causal force, cf. 60 with n., 663 with 663-4n.

1387 ὦ τᾶν is a colloquial but courteous and respectful way of addressing parents, social superiors, or peers who are not intimates. Often, as here, it introduces an admonition or suggestion, cf. *OT* 1145, Eur. *Held.* 688. ὦ τᾶν is not found in Aesch., occurs 3x in Soph. and 4x in Eur., but appears 20+ times in Ar. Sometimes (though not here) there is a touch of irony or incongruity in the respect ὦ τᾶν conveys toward rather disresponsible addressees, e.g. Pentheus at Eur. *Ba.* 802, satyrs at Soph. fr. 314.104 (from *Ichneutai*), the Kyklops at Eur. *Cyc.* 536. Cf. Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 802, Stevens 1945: 103, Björck 1950: 275-7.

διδάσκου... κακοῖς 'teach yourself not to be (too) bold among evils', i.e. among the evils that surround you. For the dat., cf. 1376-7n., cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1183 μηδὲν θρασύνου μηδὲ τοῖς σαντοῦ κακοῖς.

1388 ὀλεῖς... λόγους: γινώσκω σε (ὅτι ὀλεῖς με) is parenthetical. The dat. of means goes with ὀλεῖς.

1389 οὐκουν... ἔγωγε 'not I, at any rate'. For οὐκουν... γε in dialogue, introducing an emphatic neg. response, see *GP* 423.

1390-1 ἐγώ... ὅρα: the emendation, ἐγώ, creates an unusual but not unparalleled synizesis in which the final syllable of ἐγώ and οὐκ are pronounced together as one syllable, cf. *Ant.* 458 ἐγὼ οὐκ, *OT* 332 ἐγὼ οὐτ', 1002 ἐγὼ οὐχί, *OC* 939 ἐγὼ οὐτ', 998 ἐγὼ οὐδέ. See too 585 ἐγὼ εἰμ' with 585-9n. The emendation has two advantages: (1) it avoids making 1390 ἐγῶγ' echo Ne.'s ἔγωγε in the previous line, which might imply a bitterness on the part of Phil. against Ne. as well as the sons of Atreus - a bitterness that would be dramatically inappropriate,

given their renewed friendship; (2) the question produced by the emendation, ‘Do I not know that the sons of Atreus cast me out?’, is livelier and more rhetorically effective in stichomythia than the simple statement, ‘I know that the sons of Atreus cast me out.’ ἄλλ’... ὅρα ‘but see (i.e. ‘consider’) if, having cast you away, they will save you again’. πάλιν σώσουσ’ suggests both that they will bring you *back* from Lemnos to Troy and that they will take you *again* into their community.

1392 οὐδέποθ’... ἰδεῖν ‘never, if the condition (of being saved) is that I must see Troy willingly’. Cf. 999 οὐδέποτέ γ’ with 999–1000n., 1197. ὥστε introducing a condition or proviso (= ἐφ’ ὧ) is found mainly in prose (Smyth §2268, K–G II.504–5), but cf. *OC* 602 πῶς δῆτα σ’ ἂν πεμψαίῃθ’, ὥστ’ οἰκεῖν δίχα; ‘how, then, if they send for you, on the condition that you live apart?’ ἐκόντα is pred. adj. in agreement with μ’ understood as subj. of ἰδεῖν in the ὥστε clause; it gains emphasis not only from γ’ but by its displacement to a position preceding ὥστε and remote from ἰδεῖν (hyperbaton, cf. Smyth §3028).

1393 τί... δρῶμεν: cf. 895 with 894–7n., 757 with n.

1393–4 εἰ... λέγω: for ἐν λόγοις, cf. 60 with n. ὦν = ἐκείνων ᾧ. The fut. inf. after δυνησόμεσθα makes the (disappointed) anticipation or hope more prominent, cf. *GMT* §113. For the double acc. of person (σε) and thing (μηδέν) after πείσειν, cf. *OC* 797 οἶδα γάρ σε ταῦτα μὴ πείθων.

1395–6 ὥς... σωτηρίας ‘since it is easiest for me (that I) cease from my words, and that you go on living, just as you live now, without salvation’, with ἐμέ or αὐτόν understood as subj. of λῆξαι. For ῥάιστα + inf., cf. 524–5 αἰσχροῖ... φανῆναι.

1397 ἔα... δεῖ: cf. 1369, *Ant.* 95–6 ἄλλ’ ἔα με καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ δυσβολίαν | παθεῖν τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο. πάσχειν ‘to keep on suffering’ is used in the same way as 1396 ζῆν, to denote Phil.’s continuing, subjective experience, while παθεῖν ‘to suffer’ views all Phil.’s sufferings, from the outside, as it were, in their totality. The harsh asyndeton makes the line more striking and emphatic.

1398–9 ᾧ... οἴκους: cf. 1367–8. For redundant ταῦτα, ‘resuming’ and giving clarity and emphasis to ᾧ, of which it is the grammatical antecedent, cf. 1247–8 with n.. For simple ἦνεσας = ξυνήνεσας, cf. 48n.

1399 ταῦτά μοι... τέκνον: ταῦτα sums up the rel. clause in the previous line and a half, to which it is, formally, the grammatical antecedent. πέμπειν... οἴκους defines the action to which ᾧ refers. Phil. strengthens his appeal by addressing Ne. as τέκνον, reminding him again of their special relationship in which, as a ‘son’, Ne. should obey his ‘father’.

1400 μὴ βράδυνε ‘and don’t be slow’. βράδυνε is intrans., cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 730 εἰ βραδύνοιμεν βοῆῃ, Pl. *Rep.* 528d6 σπεύδων... μᾶλλον βραδύνω. The verb also could be understood as transitive, with τὸ πρᾶγμα or ἡμᾶς supplied as obj. or acc. of respect. Cf. *El.* 1501 ἡ δ’ ὁδὸς βραδύνεται, *OC* 1628 πάλαι δὴ τὰπὸ σοῦ βραδύνεται.

1400-1 μηδ'... γόοις 'and don't make further mention of Troy; I've had enough lamentation with wailing'. μοι is dat. of agent with the impersonal perf. pass. γόοις is both dat. of accompanying circumstance and dat. of means. Α θρῆνος is a dirge – a song of lamentation or commemoration of the dead – and a γόος properly denotes lamentation for the dead through loud crying or groaning, often mingled with tears (cf. *DELG* s.v. γοάω).

1402-8 In response to Phil.'s refusal to compromise and the moral pressure he applies, Ne. is persuaded to live up to the promise he never actually made (cf. 1367-8 with n.). As the two men set out for the ship, the metre shifts suddenly and dramatically to trochaic tetrameter catalectic (Introd., p. 39), which up to this point has not been used in the play. Elsewhere in tragedy, this metre is found in scenes of heightened dramatic tension (e.g. Aesch. *Per.* 215-48, *Ag.* 1649-73, Eur. *Ion* 1250-60), descriptions of swift, violent action (e.g. Eur. *Her.* 855-73, *Ba.* 604-41), or rapid, lively exchanges, often with or among servants (e.g. Eur. *IT* 1203-33, *Hel.* 1621-41, *Ion* 510-65). Cf. Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 604-41, Mastronarde on Eur. *Pho.* 588-637. Here the metrical shift marks the key moment of decision, as Ne. gives in to his conscience. Cf. *OT* 1515, where the metre changes as Kreon insists that Oidipous go indoors and the two move to do so; Eur. *Pho.* 588, where Eteokles' change to tetrameters after Iokasta's speech reflects his fatal decision. The change in metre may also have hinted at closure (cf. *OT* 1515-30, Aesch. *Ag.* 1649-73), which would have surprised an audience familiar with the traditional myth and expecting Phil. to go to Troy (Hoppin 1990: 142-9). The intensity of the stichomythia is heightened by *antilabē* in every line through 1407, which has double *antilabē* – the only example of this phenomenon in a tetrameter in Soph.'s surviving plays. This unusual sequence of reciprocal *antilabai* signals Ne.'s decision, grounded in renewed friendship, to take Phil. home and Phil.'s reciprocal offer to use the bow of Her. to protect Ne. (1405-7). Phil.'s expression of solidarity and practical support is a crucial beginning of his movement away from an isolated, asocial existence on Lemnos toward reintegration into human society. It seems to herald, or even to call forth, Her.'s intervention *ex machina* at 1409, which Phil. is now, as it were, able to hear and from which he can now benefit (cf. 1406-7n., Matthiessen 1981: 24-5, Newman 1991: 307-8, 310; Carlevale 2000: 54-6). In particular, the renewed friendship between Phil. and Ne. looks forward to Her.'s use of the dual at 1436-7, where he links this friendship with the fall of Troy. Cf. Steidle 1968: 187, Easterling 1978: 35.

1402 εἰ... στείχωμεν one might expect ἀλλ' before εἰ δοκεῖ, strengthening the exhortation; cf. 526, 645, 1407, 1291-2n. Its absence makes Ne.'s decision to rescue Phil. on Phil.'s own terms seem even more abrupt and dramatic. ὦ... ἦτος 'o, you who have spoken a noble word', i.e. the word στείχωμεν. In Phil.'s view, this word reflects Ne.'s inborn nobility (cf. 799); for the audience or reader, it recalls and contradicts the 'nobility' that Od. urged on Ne. in the Prologue (51) and brings home how Ne. has changed from Od.'s ὑπηρέτης (15, 53) to Phil.'s friend. 1402 is one of only two trochaic tetrameter catalectic lines

in surviving Attic tragedy that lacks word-end at position 8 (the other is Aesch. *Pers.* 165, where a plausible suggestion by Porson would eliminate the anomaly). Various emendations have been suggested, including Porson's proposal to delete εἰ δοκεῖ at the beginning of the line, which would make 1402 an iambic trimeter with a normal caesura at position 7 (Porson 1815: 197). But a single trimeter spoken by Ne., especially after the balanced exchange in 1393-1401, is unlikely, and the significant parallel with 526 and 645 is weakened without εἰ δοκεῖ. The change of meter is far more effective if it marks Ne.'s change of mind at the beginning of 1402, with the metrical anomaly within the line calling attention to Phil.'s joy at Ne.'s unexpected decision (and perhaps to his stumbling effort to begin moving, which elicits Ne.'s suggestion in the first half of 1403 that Phil. lean against him for support). Regular word-end at position 8 in the tetrameter should be thought of as a norm, like the avoidance of polysyllabic word-end in a heavy final syllable at position 9 in the iambic trimeter, not as an absolute requirement or 'law'. Cf. 22-3n., Fraenkel 1977: 76.

1403 ἀντέριδε... σὴν 'now support your walking against (mine)'. The abstract noun of action, βάσιν (cf. 1378), expresses the process of Phil.'s laboured movement as he leans against Ne. (in a visual echo of 893-4) and the two begin to move slowly toward the *eisodos* leading in the direction of the ship. This is just the kind of πρόσουρον ('neighbourly') βάσιν which the Chorus at 691 described Phil. as lacking in his years alone on the island. *vuv:* for the change of *vūv*, the reading of the MSS, to the enclitic, cf. 123-4n. *εἰς... σθένω* 'as much as I have strength (to do)', cf. Pl. *Rep.* 607a1 εἰς ὅσον δύνανται, LSJ *s.v.* ὅσος vi.

1404 αἰτίαν... φεύξομαι 'but the blame, how will I escape the (blame) of the Achaeans'? αἰτίαν is doubly emphatic by its position at the beginning of the line and the beginning of the sentence, before πῶς, which normally would come first.

1405 τί γάρ... ἐμὴν: τί, τί γάρ or τί δέ, followed by εἰ with the indic. or opt. or ἦν with the subjunct., is colloquial ('What if...?'). Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 351 τί γάρ ἦν κατίδωσι... Σίμωννα, τί δρῶσιν; *Av.* 1655 τί δ' ἦν ὁ πατήρ ἐμοὶ διδῶν τὰ χρήματα; Cf. Stevens 1945: 101, 1976: 30-1. τί γάρ frequently asks a question that introduces a new consideration, after a previous question has been answered: 1404 Ne. 'How will I escape their blame'? Phil. 'Don't think (about it)'. 1405 Ne. 'What if they sack my land'? Cf. *GP* 81-2.

1406-7 τίνα... πελάζειν: Ne. is so agitated that he interrupts Phil. twice, at the end of 1405 and again at the end of 1407. προσωφέλησιν is *hapax legomenon* in surviving Greek literature. The periphrasis προσωφέλησιν ἐρξεις (cf. Aesch. *Per.* 786 πῆματ' ἐρξαντες) is fuller and more intense than the verb προσωφελῆω which he will help him. Cf. 1236n., Long 1968: 67. *βέλεσι τοῖς Ἡρακλέους;* Phil.'s mention of Her.'s arrows prepares the way for the god's appearance at 1409 (cf. 1402-8n.) and is a reminder of the close link between Her. and Phil.,

which is especially prominent in the final seventy lines of the play. Cf. 1426-7, 1431-3 with n.

1407-8 εἶρξω . . . αὐδᾶις; εἶρξω . . . πάτρας (referring back to 1405 χώραν τὴν ἐμὴν) is Phil.'s response to πῶς λέγεις. Then Ne.'s final comment includes the last four syllables of 1407 and all of 1408, with enjambment marking the end of the stichomythia (cf. 1255-6). ἀλλ' εἰ (δοκεῖ) at the end of 1407 is in character for Ne. (cf. 526, 645 at earlier moments of apparently imminent departure), and closes the sequence that opens with 1402 εἰ δοκεῖ, στείχωμεν. Either Porson's ταῦτα δρᾶν ὅπωςπερ or Pearson's σοὶ τὸ δρᾶν τὰδ' ὥσπερ would provide appropriate sense at the beginning of 1408, but Porson's ὅπωςπερ is more Sophoklean, cf. *Aj.* 1179, *OT* 1336 (the word does not occur in Aesch. or Eur.). Most recent editors accept the deletion of σῆς . . . αὐδᾶις and take εἶρξω πελάζειν as a complete sentence. This produces, as the final tetrameter, Ne. πῶς λέγεις. Φι. εἶρξω πελάζειν. Ne. στεῖχε προσκύσας χθόνα, a line which assumes (1) that σῆς πάτρας was a marginal gloss on πέλαζειν that found its way into the text, and (2) that ἀλλ' εἰ . . . αὐδᾶις was added in a failed attempt to fill in what was metrically deficient. But this tetrameter, constructed by deletion, would make Ne.'s final comment both begin and end most abruptly. στεῖχε . . . χθόνα;

cf. 533-4 προσκύσαντε . . . εἰσοίκησιν, 1402 στείχωμεν. Now that Ne. has returned the bow, the real departure of the two friends from the island is at hand, after their false or frustrated efforts to leave when Ne. was lying to Phil. as part of Od.'s σόφισμα.

1409-17 As Ph. and Ne. move slowly toward the side-passageway, Her. (as if summoned by Phil.'s mention of his arrows at 1406) appears without warning on the roof of the *skēnē* and stops them from leaving. Chanting anapaests in epic diction and style, Her. speaks both on his own divine authority and for Zeus and emphasizes that he has come to announce Zeus's plans for Phil. (1413). Her. moves forward until he reaches a position on the platform projecting from the the *skēnē*-roof, from which he addresses both Phil. and Ne. more expansively in iambic trimeters (1418-44). This is the only *deus ex machina* ending in the surviving plays of Soph., though there may have been similar divine epiphanies at the end of *Athamas* (with Herakles as the god) and of *Peleus* (with Thetis), and gods appear on stage in *Ajax* and the fragmentary *Niobe*. Her. is the only god in surviving Attic tragedy who speaks in anapaests *ex machina* at the end of a play, though Okeanos does so at *PV* 284-97, when he first arrives to converse with Prometheus. Choral anapaests announce the appearance of Thetis at Eur. *Andr.* 1226-30 and Kastor and Pollux at Eur. *El.* 1233-7, after which these gods speak in trimeters, though Kastor also engages in an anapaestic exchange with Elektra and Orestes (1294-1356) before the final choral anapaests. Her. is particularly appropriate in the role of *deus ex machina*, given the importance throughout the play of his bow, his previous sack of Troy (cf. 1439-40), and his apotheosis (with the help of Phil., cf. 670, 726-9, 801-3). Her.'s assertion that his own labours (1419 πόνους), followed by 'immortal ἀρετή', are a model for Phil.'s making his life 'glorious'

εὐκλεῖ) through *his* labours (1422 πόνων), suggests that Her. considers the future sack of Troy by Phil. and the Greek army and his own earlier sack of the city (1439-40), to be 'cultural' achievements analogous to these labours (Alessandri 2009: 120-1), which included slaying wild beasts and anti-social monsters and criminals.

It is striking that in *Od.* 11, Od. tells the Phaeacians that when he met the εἶδωλον ('image') of Herakles in the land of the dead, the εἶδωλον told him, '[Y]ou too are leading a (life of) evil doom, the very one which I used to bear beneath the rays of the sun. I was the son of Zeus, son of Kronos, but I had hardship without end...' (*Od.* 11.618-21). In the *Od.*, where Od. not only is the main hero but presents himself to the Phaeacians as the greatest of heroes, this association of himself with Herakles is self-serving but plausible. There is, however, a long tradition of denigrating Odysseus, going back to the *Kypria* (cf. 1025-28n.), and in the play Od. is less an epic hero than a recognizably late fifth-century political type. In the ending, Her. ignores Od. completely and magnifies Phil.'s heroism by comparing his heroic career with Her.'s own - a comparison that would have all the more point for those members of the audience and readers who realize that Soph. has transformed Her.'s praise of Od. in *Od.* 11 into praise of Od.'s antagonist in the play. Furthermore, an Athenian audience would have been predisposed to consider Her.'s appearance *ex machina* ethically and dramatically appropriate, because of his legendary initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries and worship in Attica as a cult-hero who 'wards off harm' (Ἀλεξίκακος) and in other cities as a saviour (Σώτηρ). Cf. Greengard 1987: 90-3; *Intro.*, pp. 12, 29.

1409-10 μήπω γε... μύθων 'don't (go) yet, until you hear our authoritative words'. μήπω γε goes with στείχετε understood. From Homeric epic on, μῦθος (-οι) can denote an authoritative speech act; here it stands opposed to the deceptive λόγοι that are so prominent in the play up to this point. Cf. 1417, Podlecki 1966: 244-5, Martin 1989: 12, 14, 16-18, 66.

1411-12 φάσκειν... ὅψιν 'think that you hear in your ears the sound of Herakles and that you see a vision (of me)'. Cf. *Il.* 24.632 εἰσορώων ὅψιν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ μῦθον ἀκούων. ἀκοή can denote both the activity of hearing and the ear(s) by which one hears: cf. Sappho 31.11-12 ἐπιρρόμ- | βεῖσι δ' ἀκουσι. φάσκειν is inf. for imper., cf. 57, 1080. Like φημί, φάσκω 'say' often means 'think', 'deem'; cf. *El.* 9 φάσκειν Μυκήνας... ὀρᾶν. The irregular position of τε, following ἀκοῇ rather than κλύειν, where it would be parallel to τε following λεύσσειν, calls attention to Phil.'s reception of the sound of Her.'s voice. Cf. *GP* 519-20. In epic, αὐδή and αὐδήσσσα can describe the (sound of a) human voice (e.g. *Il.* 13.757 Ἑκτορος ἔκλυον αὐδήν), but αὐδήσσσα also describes Kirke, who uses human speech, i.e. makes her voice sound human (*Od.* 10.136 = 11.8 = 12.150 = 12.449 δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήσσσα). αὐδήν is, therefore, particularly appropriate to the sound of Herakles' voice—the voice of a mortal who has become a god and is now speaking to a mortal. Cf. *Od.* 5.334 βροτὸς αὐδήσσσα, referring to Leukothee,

'who previously was a mortal with a human voice, but now in the depths of the sea shares in the gods' honour' (*Od.* 5.334-5).

1413 τὴν σὴν... χάριν is adv. acc. of manner (*Smyth* §1608, cf. *Tr.* 42); κείνου τε καὶ σὴν ἐξ ἴσου κοινήν χάριν 'for his and your common advantage equally'.

1413-14 οὐρανίως... προλιπών: cf. *Aesch.* *PV* 299-301 'having left the stream named for you and your self-built, rock-roofed caves...'. *Her.* speaks as if he were granting a prayer, in which *Phil.* had reminded him that he had come to his aid in the past and/or asked him to do so now. Cf. *Sappho.* 1.5-9... 25; 'but come to this place, if ever on another occasion, | having heard my voice from afar. | you heeded and, having left your father's golden | house, you came, having yoked your chariot.... |... | Come to me even now...'

1416 κατερητύσων... στέλλῃ 'to hold you back from the journey on which you are setting forth'. κατερητύσων is fut. participle of purpose after ἦκω. This is the only occurrence of epic κατερητύω in extant Attic tragedy. Cf. *Od.* 19.543-5 ὁ μοι αἰετός... φωνῇ... βροτέῃ κατερήτυε φώνησέν τε.

1417 οὐ... ἐπακούσον: *Her.* ends as he began, with a verb of hearing governing μύθων (cf. 1409-10 πρὶν ἂν... ἀπὸ μύθων). Such 'ring-composition' is common in early Greek poetry. For ἐπακούω used of hearing and heeding the voice of a god, cf. *OT* 794-6 κάγω 'πακούσας ταῦτα τὴν Κορινθίαν... ἐπευγον. *Od.* 14.327-8 = 19.296-7 ὄφρα θεοῖο | ἐκ δρυὸς ὑπνικόμοιο Διὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσαι. For ἐπακούω in a prayer to a god, cf. *Aesch.* *Cho.* 722-5 ὦ πότνια χθών καὶ πότνι' Ἀκτὴ... νῦν ἐπακούσον, νῦν ἐπάρηξον.

1418-44 *Her.* explains to *Phil.* why he has come and tells him what lies in store for him at Troy and what he is to do with the spoils and rewards he obtains there. He informs *Ne.* that he will share with *Phil.* in the sack of Troy, commands the two of them to guard one another like two lions 'feeding in the same pasture' (1436), and tells them to remember to act piously 'in things that have to do with the gods' when they take the city, because human 'piety' is Zeus's greatest concern.

1418 καὶ... τύχῃ there is no corresponding ἐπειτα δ' ἐγὼ in antithesis to καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σοι. Rather σοι is juxtaposed with ἐμὸς later in the line and μὲν stands alone, as it frequently does at the opening of speeches in Attic drama and early oratory (*GP* 382-3). Cf. *Aj.* 1 αἶψα μὲν... δέδορκα σε with Stanford's n. 815 ὁ μὲν σφαγεὺς ἐσθίεν, *Ant.* 223 ἀναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὐχ ὅπως τάχους ὕπο | δυσπνοῦς λυκάω. τύχῃ (cf. 1417) is defined and expanded by 1419 δούσους... πόνους.

1419-20 δούσους... ἔσχον lit. 'having laboured at and persisted to the end in how many labours | achieved immortal excellence', i.e. 'an undying reputation for excellence'. For ἀρετὴ in the sense of 'reputation for excellence', 'fame', 'glory transcending death', cf. *Eur. Andr.* 776-7 ἀρετὰ καὶ θανοῦσι λάμπει, *Her.* 357-8 γυναικῶν... ἀρεταὶ πόνων | τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἐγαλμα, LSJ s.v. iii. In the previous passage, of course, *Her.* himself is undying, not only his 'reputation for excellence'. The phrase ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν gains emphasis from the resolution

at positions 2 and 4, as does *δοσους* . . . *πόνους* from the separation of the adj. and noun from one another by the two aor. participles, which agree with the subj. of *ἔσχον* ('ingressive' aor., cf. 1098 φρονῆσαι with 1098–1100n., 1259 ἔσωφρόνησας, cf. *Aj.* 465 ἔσχε στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν, *Ant.* 1228–9 τίνα | νοῦν ἔσχες;). The etymological figure *πονῆσας* . . . *πόνους* makes Her.'s statement still more forceful (cf. 1248–9, 1380). *δοσους* . . . *πόνους* might seem to promise an enumeration of Her.'s labours, of the kind found, e.g., at Eur. *Her.* 359–435, but Her. is concerned with his 'immortal excellence' as a model for what Phil. will achieve, not with the details of his own labours.

1421–2 καὶ . . . βίον lit. 'and to you, know (it) clearly, it is owed to suffer this (by way of recompense) – to make your life glorious after and through these labours'. Her. reassures Phil. that his experiences will after all be like Her.'s own, and at 1422 *πόνων* links Phil. with Her. (*πονῆσας* . . . *πόνων*) at 1419. καὶ . . . παθεῖν: cf. *El.* 1173 πᾶσιν γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦτ' ὀφείλεται παθεῖν, where τοῦτ' refers to death as 'a debt we all must suffer' (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 419 ὥς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται). In 1421, however, τοῦτ' is explained in the following line as 'to make (your) life glorious', i.e. to transcend death. **σάφ' ἴσθι:** Her. introduces his authoritative statement of Phil.'s heroic destiny with a characteristically Odyssean phrase (cf. 976–7n.), which invites a viewer or reader to consider how this destiny is compatible with Od.'s success in deceiving Phil. **εὐκλεῖα . . . βίον:** these words, coming immediately after Her. has referred to his own 'immortal excellence', may possibly allude to a fifth-century hero cult of Phil. on Chryse, near Lemnos, with which Soph.'s audience could have been familiar, given the longstanding Athenian political and commercial association with the island. Phil. certainly was worshipped as a hero at the supposed site of his grave in Makalla in southern Italy, but it is unlikely that Soph. would have made, or his audience would have recognized, an allusion to this relatively distant and obscure cult. Cf. *Introd.*, pp. 30–1.

1423 τῶιδ' ἀνδρί: i.e. Ne. Her. does not at any point mention or refer to Od.

1424–30 πρῶτον . . . πλάκα 'first you will be stopped from (i.e. "cured of") your painful disease, and having been chosen (as) first in the army for your prowess, with my bow you will deprive Paris of life, who was the cause of these evils; and you will sack Troy, and having received from the army the prize for prowess, you will send the spoils to your palace, to the plateau of Mt Oita in your fatherland, for (your) father Poias'. For the two asymmetrical μέν . . . τε . . . sequences, 1424–5 πρῶτον μέν . . . ἀρετῇ τε . . . and 1426–8 Πάριον μέν . . . πέρεσις τε . . ., cf. 1056–9 with n., 1136–7.

1426 τῶνδ' . . . κακῶν: the deictic suggests some sort of gesture by Her. toward evils that are present and visible, such as Phil.'s diseased foot and generally ragged condition after ten years of sojourn on Lemnos. Paris is 'responsible (αἵτιος) for these evils' because he is ultimately responsible for the Trojan War of which the evils are an outcome.

1427 τόξοις τοῖς ἑμοῖς is a reminder of the close connection between Her. and Phil. symbolized by the bow, cf. 1406–7 with n., 1431–3 with n.

1428–9 σκῦλα . . . πέμψεις: for a hero sending home spoils in advance of his own return, cf. *Tr.* 283–6, where the women captives from Oichalia are sent home by Herakles before he himself arrives. πέμψεις could also mean that Phil. will ‘escort’ the spoils home himself with ‘triumphant pomp’ (Jebb), though usually it is persons, not things, who are escorted in this way (cf. 1368 πέμψον.) The σκῦλα would be hung on or nailed to the wall of a palace or temple, cf. Eur. *El.* 7, 1000, *IT* 74.

ἀριστεῖ . . . στρατεύματος ‘having received them (i.e. the σκῦλα) from the army as a prize of valour’. ἀριστεῖ is pred. acc. For the historical custom of awarding such a prize of valour, cf. Hdt. 8.123.1 ἀριστήϊα δώσοντες τῷ ἀξιωτάτῳ γενομένῳ Ἑλλήνων ἀνὰ τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον.

1430 πάτρας Οἴτης: cf. 453 ὦ γένεθλον Οἰταίου πατρός.

1431–3 ἃ δ’ . . . κόμιζε ‘whatever spoils you receive from this army, (from these) bring a memorial of my bow to my pyre’, i.e. some of the spoils are to be dedicated at the site where Herakles burned and became divine (cf. 727–9, 801–2), as a tribute and thank-offering to him and his bow as instrumental in the achievements for which Phil. will have been rewarded. Cf. Σ ἐκ τῶν ἀριστείων καὶ τιμῆσιν. After a victory, a Greek army would frequently donate part of the spoils, sometimes as much as a tenth, to one or more gods. Cf. Hdt. 8.121.2: ‘(after the battle of Salamis), they divided the plunder and sent the best portion to Delphi’; Thuc. 1.132.2 ‘. . . the tripod in Delphi, which the Greeks dedicated as first fruits from the Medes’. For τούτων, partitive gen. and antecedent of ἃ, cf. πάντων, partitive gen. and antecedent of ὅσα in 1162 with 1161–2n. τοῦδε τοῦ στρατοῦ is gen. of source with ἐκλαβών, cf. *OT* 1022 δῶρόν ποτ’, ἴσθι, τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν λαβών.

1433–7 καὶ . . . τόνδ’ ‘and to you too, son of Achilles, I spoke these things by way of advice. For neither do you without this man have the strength to take the plain of Troy nor this man without you; but the two of you, like two lions feeding in the same pasture, keep guard, this man on you and you on this man’. After 1433 κόμιζε, Her. interrupts his address to Phil., turns to Ne. with the words καὶ σοί, and speaks to him through the first half of 1437. ταῦτ’, the reading of the MSS, refers to the general sense of 1423–8 – that Phil. will accompany Ne. to Troy, be healed, kill Paris, and sack the city – but perhaps Heath’s conjecture, ταῦτ’ ‘these same things’, is correct. γάρ indicates that οὔτε . . . σέθεν explains σοί: ‘(I say these [same?] things to you,) for . . .’ 1433 καὶ is connective (‘and’), not adv. (‘also’); accented σοί is sufficiently emphatic to denote ‘you too’. For τὸ Τροίας πεδίον, see 69n. σέθεν is an aeolic form of the gen. of σύ inherited from epic and common in tragedy. Like other words ending in -θεν, it can be used independently or with adverbs, prepositions (here ἄτερ), or compound verbs to indicate distance, proximity, or separation from. σέθεν can also have other genitival functions, e.g. comparison or as part of a gen.

absolute, but like other personal pronouns in Aeolic it rarely, if ever, indicates possession. Cf. Chantraine, *GH* 1.241–4. ὥς λέοντε συννόμω might seem to mean ‘like two lions pasturing together’ (cf. νομός ‘pasture’), but carnivores do not ‘pasture’; rather, the phrase suggests ‘like two lions who feed (cooperatively) (on sheep, goats, cows, etc.) in the same pasture’. Cf. *Il.* 5.554–60, where Krethôn and Orsilochos, killed by Aineias, are compared to two lions who ravage men’s pastures, snatching away cows and sheep, until they are cut down by the men’s sharp spears; *Il.* 13.198–202, where the two Ajaxes, who seize, kill, strip, and gruesomely behead Imbrios, are compared to two lions who seize and carry off a goat in their jaws. Thus ὥς λέοντε συννόμω, the only extended simile in the play and one of only two lion similes in Soph.’s surviving plays (cf. *Aj.* 986–7), while imaging the shared heroism of Phil. and Ne. in a positive way, also suggests its savage, anti-social quality. The simile also recalls *Il.* 10.297, where Od. and Diomedes go ‘like two lions through the dark night’ to spy on the Trojans, then capture and butcher Dolon, the Trojan spy, slaughter the Thracian king Rhesos and twelve of his men, and steal Rhesos’ horses. Thus, even in a passage that appears to present Ne., along with Phil., in a heroic light, Ne. does not entirely escape an association with the ethically ambiguous and unsavoury Od. Cf. Wolff 1979: 144–50. φυλάσσετον is second person dual, pres. imper. act. The reciprocity indicated by the chiasmic sequence of pronouns in 1437, οὗτος σὲ . . . σὺ τόνδ’, reinforces both the equality inherent in the use of the dual and the association of Phil. and Ne.’s friendship with the destruction of Troy. Cf. 1402–8n.

1437–40 ἐγὼ δ’ . . . ἀλῶναι is a kind of parenthesis between Her.’s command to Ne. and Phil. to guard one another (1436–7) and his injunction that they remember to be pious during the sack of Troy (1441–4). Speaking to Phil., he assures him that he will send Asklepios, the physician-god, to Troy to heal him, and he explains this statement by the ‘necessity’ (χρεών) that the city be taken by his bow ‘a second time’. The implied sequence of thought is: my bow must sack Troy a second time, therefore I will send Asklepios to heal the man who wields my bow. Troy fell to Her.’s bow the first time, when he sacked the city to punish its king, Laomedon, for not rewarding him appropriately, after he had rescued the Trojan princess Hesione from a sea-monster. Cf. *Il.* 5.638–42, 14.250–1, 20.145–8, Pind. *Nem.* 4.25–6, *Isthm.* 5.35–8, *Isthm.* 6.27–31, *Aj.* 1300–3, Eur. *Andr.* 797–801. Ne. had told Phil., at 1333–4, that if he came to Troy, he would meet and be ‘eased’ of his disease by the sons of Asklepios (the physician-warriors, Machaon and Podaleirios, familiar from the *Il.*), not by the god himself. There is, however, no real contradiction between Ne.’s words and Her.’s promise to send Asklepios: Ne. speaks as a human, for whom human physicians will do the healing; Herakles speaks as a god, for whom Asklepios is the relevant healer, though perhaps he should be thought of as acting through his human sons. Cf. 1332–5n.

1438 παυστήρα . . . σῆς νόσου: παυστήρα is pred. acc. in agreement with Ἀσκληπιόν. A noun ending in -τηρ (or less often, -τωρ) is a so-called ‘agent

noun', used of a person who does the action denoted by the verb from which the noun is derived. -τηρ nouns are common in Homeric epic, from which they are inherited by the tragic poets, but otherwise they are rare in Attic, which tends instead to use nouns ending in -της. Cf. Chantraine 1933: 321–2.

1439 αὐτήν: the antecedent is τὴν πόλιν or Τροίαν understood from 1438 ἴλιον and 1435 Τροίης. ἴλιον is regularly neut. (cf. 454), though fem. at Eur. *Andr.* 103.

1440–4 Her. concludes his speech by commanding Phil. and Ne. to remember to act with piety 'in matters regarding the gods', when they sack Troy. This command, as Σ and many later scholars have remarked, is a clear allusion to the story that Ne. acted with conspicuous *impiety* during the sack of the city by butchering Priam on the altar of Zeus Herkeios. Cf. *Sack of Ilum, Argumentum* (Bernabé 1996: 88, West 2003: 144–5); Pind. *Paean* 6.113–15; Eur. *Tro.* 16–17. This allusion implies that Ne. will fall from the height of nobility he reaches when he returns the bow to Phil., after helping Od. to steal it. The reminder of Ne.'s ruthlessness toward the helpless Priam is particularly disturbing, because his pity and respect for Phil. seem, on the surface, so similar to Achilles' for the Trojan king in *Il.* 24. If an audience or reader should recall the unflattering story of Ne.'s death at Delphi, (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1085–1165, *Or.* 1654–7, Pind. *Paian* 6.112–20), the instability of his return to 'the Achillean standard' (Knox 1964: 123) would be still more evident. 'The glory, health and *sōtēria* attained by Phil. are joined arm in arm with the shadow of the future which darkens Neoptolemos' (Taplin 1987: 76). Cf. the similar hinting beyond the end of the play at *El.* 1497–8, when Aigisthos asks if 'this palace must see the present and future troubles of the sons of Pelops', and at *OC* 1769–72, when Antigone tells Theseus to send her to Thebes, 'if somehow we might prevent the slaughter that is coming upon our blood brothers' (Easterling 1978: 39).

1440–1 ἐννοεῖθ' . . . θεούς: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 338–40: 'but if they (i.e. the Greeks) act piously (εὐσεβοῦσι) toward the gods who hold the city, the gods of the conquered land, and the shrines of the gods, they would not be taken in turn, having having taken (the land)'; Aesch. *Pers.* 809–15. The correction of ἐννοεῖθ', the reading of most MSS, is based on the fact that all the other examples of ἐννοεῶ in Aesch. and Soph. are active (e.g. 28), even though Eur. regularly uses ἐννοοῦμαι as a deponent. Cf. Elmsley on Eur. *Med.* 852–3 with n. (= 882–3 in the standard numbering of the text).

1442–3 ὥς . . . Ζεύς: ὥς provides the basis for Her.'s judgement and command that Phil. and Ne. should remember to be pious when they sack Troy, because 'Zeus considers all other things secondary'; cf. Smyth §§2993. ὥς also indicates that the thought or assertion is that of Zeus, the subject of the sentence (cf. Smyth §2996). δεύτερ' is pred. adj. modifying τὰλλα πάντα. Cf. *OC* 351–2 (ἡ) δεύτερ' ἡγείται τὰ τῆς | οἴκοι διαίτης, εἰ πατὴρ τροφήν ἔχοι '(Antigone) considers the (comforts) of life at home secondary, if her father should have (her) attention and care'.

1443-4 οὐ... ἀπόλλυται: οὐ for ἡ and ἡσύβεια, with restored def. article before εὐσέβεια, are necessary emendations. Her.'s point is that the 'name and fame' of piety 'survive... after death' (Linforth 1956: 149 n. 30), like the ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν that Her. won through his labours (1419-20) and the εὐκλεῶ βίον that Phil. will make for himself (1422). Cf. Eur. fr. 734.1-2 (from *Temenidai*) ἀρετὴ δὲ κἂν θάνῃ τις οὐκ ἀπόλλυται, | ζῆι δ' οὐκέτ' ὄντος σώματος. In 1443 Her. implies that Phil. and Ne. can win this 'name and fame' by respecting the shrines and altars of the gods during the sack of the city; cf. 1440-4n.

1445-71 The play concludes in anapaestic dimeter, with monometer in 1446 and 1450 and paroemiacs in 1451, 1468, and 1471 (cf. *Introd.*, p. 39). At 1445-8, Phil. and Ne. turn or move toward Her. as they express acceptance of his commands; then Her. exits after 1451 in the crane by which he entered. While Phil. chants 1452-68, he and Ne. together slowly move toward the *eisodos* leading toward the ship, and the Chorus follow them along the *eisodos* after chanting the final three lines.

1445-7 ὦ... μύθοις 'O (you) who have sent a voice longed for by me and have appeared after so long a time! I will not disobey your words'. Phil.'s exclamatory, emotional tone is marked by his shift to anapaests, which contrast with Her.'s more matter-of-fact trimeters and signal that the end of the play is approaching. For ὦ with the nom., cf. 1348n. For χρόνιον, cf. 600, 1449, *OC* 440-1 πόλις βίαι | ἤλαυνέ μ' ἐκ γῆς χρόνιον. οὐκ... μύθοις: cf. *Il.* 1.220-1 οὐδ' ἀπιθήσει / μύθῳ Ἀθηναίης. This echo associates Phil.'s obedience to Her.'s (and Zeus's) words with Achilles' obedience to Athene's, when she tells him not to kill Agamemnon. The effect of this association with Achilles is to magnify Phil.'s heroism, just at the point where his giving in to persuasion might seem to have the opposite effect (though Phil. yields to persuasion in a way that is not predictable from events earlier in the play). Cf. Alt 1961: 173-4, Podlecki 1966: 245n.24.

1448 κἀγὼ... τίθεμαι 'I too place my judgement in this way.' The metaphor is from voting, which involves placing pebbles (ψήφους) in urns. Cf. *Lys.* 24.23 μηδαμῶς, ὦ βουλὴ, ταύτηι θέσθαι τὴν ψῆφον. In the present passage, ταύτην, the reading of some MSS, would also be possible: 'I too place this judgement' (cf. *Andoc.* 3.21 τίνα γνώμην ἔθεντο περὶ ὑμῶν... , *Pl. Laws* 674a2 οὐκ ἂν τιθείμην ταύτην τὴν γνώμην), but γνώμην ταύτηι is more idiomatic.

1449 μή νυν... πράσσειν 'don't, then, taking a long time, delay action'. Her.'s χρόνιοι in effect responds to Phil.'s χρόνιος in 1446: you say *I've* been a long time in coming, but don't *you* be a long time in doing (what I've told you to do).

1450-1 ὅδ'... πρύμνην 'for this opportune moment for sailing (with a wind) at the stern urges (us) on'. καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς are a hendiadys; πλοῦς implies a favourable wind, cf. 639-42. Ne. tries to use the wind in support of his deception at 466-7 (where πλοῦς also is associated with καιρός), but Her.'s words assert a more authoritative sense of a truly favourable πλοῦς. Burges' transposition of

ὁδ' ἐπείγει γάρ from a position following καιρὸς καὶ πλοῦς to the beginning of the sentence avoids having γάρ as the sixth word in its clause, which would be unparalleled in classical Greek outside of Middle and New Comedy (cf. *GP* 96). ὁδε 'as you can see' here' implies a gesture in the direction of the favourable wind.

πρύμνην: Hermann's conjecture restores the normal Attic form, which is not, however, guaranteed by the metre as in 482. Cf. 482–3n.

1452–71 When Her. has hastened Phil. and Ne. on their way, he departs, and finally it is time for Phil., Ne., and the Chorus to leave too. Their movement begins at 1452 (cf. στείχων) and continues as Phil. chants a seventeen-line farewell to the island. First (1452–63) he tenderly personifies its physical features as friends, in language that differs notably from the harsh way in which he spoke of them earlier in the play. Then (1464–8) he urges 'the sea-surrounded land of Lemnos' to send him on a fair sailing without blaming him (for leaving), since he does so on the advice of friends and by the will of a higher power. Similar anapaests chanted by characters accompany their exits at the end of *Aj.*, *Tr.*, and *OC*, where, as here, they are followed by the concluding choral anapaests.

1452 φέρε... καλέσω: καλέσω is hortatory aor. subjunct. with φέρε, cf. 300 with n. For στείχω used of actual or imagined movement to exit the scene, cf. 983, 1065, 1219, 1402, 1408. Triklinios' νυν for νῦν is appropriate, because the word, after 1450–1, has inferential rather than temporal force. Cf. 123–4n.

1453 χαῖρ'... ἐμοί 'farewell, o, (you) house that have kept watch with me'. Phil.'s earlier apostrophes personified his rock-cave in negative terms as a kind of natural habitat, e.g. 952, 1081–9. Here, by contrast, he calls it μέλαθρον, originally 'roofbeam', then by extension 'roof', 'house', and (esp. in the plur.) 'palace', a word that suggests a product of human culture. Cf. 1262 στέγας with 1261–2n., 1263n. ξύμφουρον is *hapax legomenon* in surviving Greek literature, but in several Thessalian inscriptions the word denotes a 'fellow-guard' (LSJ *s.v.* σύμφουρος π with *Suppl.*). Cf. *Ant.* 891–2 ὦ κατασκαφῆς | οἰκησις αἰείφουρος.

1454 Νύμφαι τ' ἐνυδροὶ λειμωνιάδες 'Nymphs living in the waters and the meadows'. Cf. *Il.* 20.8–9 ~ *HH Aphr.* 97–9 νυμφάων αἶ τ'... νέμονται | καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν καὶ πίσεα ποιήεντα. At 292–5, Phil. emphasizes the difficulty with which he would crawl to fetch drinking water and the need sometimes to break up ice; here, by contrast, he evokes the island's divinely fresh, naturally moist meadows.

1455 καὶ... προβολῆς 'and the male pounding of the sea against the promontory'. προβολῆς, an emendation of προβλής, the reading of the MSS, seems necessary: the adj. προβλής does not make sense as a description of the sound of the sea, but the noun προβολῆς makes excellent sense as obj. gen., dependent on κτύπος. Musgrave's προβλής θ' makes προβλής a noun (cf. 936 προβλήτες), which would be possible but rather bland in coordination with κτύπος... πόντου: 'both the male pounding of the sea and the promontory'. προβολή 'promontory', 'headland' does not occur elsewhere in surviving

fifth- and fourth-century literary texts, but the word is used by medical writers of the classical period to denote a prominence of the skull and the projection of the tongue (LSJ *s.v.* π.2). For what it is worth, both προβολή and προβλής are found in Quintus of Smyrna (third century CE) in passages having to do with Philoktetes: *Posthom.* 9.378 ἐπὶ προβολῇσι θαλάσσης is part of a simile describing the painful swelling of Phil.'s diseased foot; *Posthom.* 10.175–6 οὐδέ νυ τὸν γε (*sc.* ποταμόν) | εἵργουσιν προβλήτες occurs in an account of how none of the Trojans could approach Phil. in battle. ἄρσιν is an ionicism = Attic ἄρρην (cf. *Introd.*, p. 31). For 'male' used of a deep, bass sound, cf. fr. 523.2–3 (from *Polyxena*) ἄρσενας χοὰς | Ἀχέροντος δξύπληγας ἡχούσας γόους 'the male (i.e. "resounding") streams of Acheron, echoing laments that go with fierce blows'; Ar. *Thesm.* 123–5 σέβομαι . . . | κίθαριν τε ματέρ' ὕμνων | ἄρσενι βοᾷ δοκίμων' I revere . . . the kithara, mother of songs renowned for (their) male sound'. Cf. Shakespeare, *The Tempest* 3.3.97–9 '... the thunder, | That deep and dreadful organ-pipe, pronounced | the name of Prosper: it did bass my trespass'; Hdt. 1.17.1 αὐλοῦ γυναικίου τε καὶ ἀνδρίου, denoting treble and bass reed-pipes.

1456–7 οὗ . . . νότου 'where many times within the recess (of my cave) my head was moistened by (violent) blasts of the south wind'. οὗ 'where' refers back to 1455 προβολῆς. πολλάκι is found only here in Soph., though πολλάκις occurs at 1019 and nine other places. δῆ often follows and intensifies 'adjectives expressing indefinite quantity or number' or 'adverbs expressing frequency, intensity, distance of space and time and so forth' (*GP* 205–6). For the position of attributive ἐνδόμυχον, cf. 391–3n. on τὸν μέγαν Πακτωλὸν εὗχρυσον. For πλῆγαῖσι 'blows' = 'blasts' of wind, cf. Lucretius *DRN* 5.995 *verbera venti*.

1458–60 πολλά . . . χειμαζομένωι 'many times Mt Hermaion sent me, in my stormy suffering, a groaning lament in response to (i.e. "echoing") my voice's groaning lament'. πολλά picks up 1456 πολλάκι. φωνῆς . . . ἡμετέρας depends on ἀντι- in ἀντίτυπον. At 188–90 the Chorus mention the echo of Phil.'s laments as a component of his suffering (ἀ δ' ἀθυρόστομος | Ἀχὼ τηλεφανῆς πικραῖς | οἰμωγαῖς ὑπακούει), and at 693–4 they comment that he had no 'neighbour to his misery' (κακογείτονα) to whom he could 'cry aloud . . . a groaning that would produce a response' (παρ' ὧι στόνον ἀντίτυπον . . . ἀποκλαύσειεν . . .). Here, however, the mountain sympathetically echoes Phil.'s groaning with its own. Ἐρμαῖον ὄρος is mentioned at Aesch. *Ag.* 283–4 (Ἐρμαῖον λέπας | Λήμνου) as the station in between Mt Ida and Mt Athos for receiving and transmitting the fire-signal sent by Agamemnon in Troy to Klytaimnestra in Argos. It probably was located on the northeast promontory of Lemnos, north of the imagined site of Phil.'s cave. Σ, however, comments, 'All mountains can be called 'Hermaion', because (Hermes) is the god of shepherds and pastures <and the herds pasture on the mountains>'. χειμαζομένωι: cf. 1194–5

ἀλύοντα χειμερίω | λύπαι, Aesch. *PV* 562–3 τόνδε χαλινόϊς ἐν πετρίνοισιν | χεϊμαζόμενον.

1461–3 νῦν δ'... ἤδη: but now, O, you springs and fresh Lykian water, we're leaving you, we're (really) leaving (you) this time'. 'Fresh Lykian water' refers to a drinkable source (ποτόν) near Phil.'s cave (cf. 21), presumably named for Ἀπόλλων Λύκ(ε)ϊος. This widespread cult-title referred (1) to Apollo as wolf-god (cf. λύκος 'wolf'), though it is unclear whether this meant wolf-like (in appearance or behaviour), wolf-killing (cf. *El.* 6), or protecting against wolves, or involved some combination of these meanings; (2) to an association of the cult with Lykia in Asia Minor, or its putative origin there. Cf. Burkert 1985: 144–5. Apollo Lyk(e)ios is often invoked as a helper, e.g. *OT* 203, 919, *El.* 645, 655, 1379; cf. Dawe on *OT* 203. A fresh-water spring on Lemnos would have been crucial in helping Phil. to sustain life. (Σ 1461, glossing Λύκιόν τε ποτόν, says that the phrase refers to a spring in Lemnos named for Lykian Apollo or because wolves came there to drink.) For the MS variant γλυκίον, cf. the ordinary use of γλυκὺς to refer to fresh, drinkable water (LSJ *s.v.* 1.b). Cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin 1:114 for reports that Apollo made two springs, of wine and honey, flow on Lemnos, where the birds would settle and Phil. would shoot them. Cf. Hermann on 1461 (1447 in his edition), Masciadri 2008: 152n.174.

λείπομεν... ἤδη 'we're leaving...', 'we're (really) leaving now' is highly emotional. For νῦν with ἤδη, denoting that an action has been or is now finally and actually being done, cf. *Ant.* 801–2 νῦν δ' ἤδη γὰρ καὶ τὸς θεσμῶν | ἔξω φέρομαι, *Od.* 23.54 νῦν δ' ἤδη τόδε μακρὸν ἔλδωρ ἐκτετέλεσται, LSJ *s.v.* ἤδη II.

δόξης... ἐπιβάντες 'never having entered on this belief', i.e. never having believed that this was possible. (Cf. Σ 'never having expected that he would end in fulfilment so as to depart for Troy'.) For the figurative use of ἐπιβαίνω, cf. *OC* 189 εὐσεβίας ἐπιβαίνοντες, *Il.* 8.285 τὸν καὶ τηλόθ' ἔοντα εὐκλείης ἐπίβησον, Hes. *Th.* 395–6 τόν δ' ἔφαθ'... | τιμῆς καὶ γεράων ἐπιβήσημεν, LSJ *s.v.* A.1.4.

1464–5 χαῖρ'... ἀμέμπτως: Phil. ends with a final farewell to 'the sea-surrounded land of Lemnos' (cf. 1 with n.), directing it to send him on a prosperous voyage without blaming him for leaving their long companionship. ἀμέμπτως may also suggest 'without my having any reason to find fault with the voyage'. For εὐπλοῖαι, dat. of manner, with the imper., cf. *OT* 51 ἀλλ' ἀσφαλείαι τήνδ' ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν.

1466–8 ἐνθ'... ἐπέκρανε: Phil. mentions three separate powers that are bringing him to Troy (ἐνθα): Fate, the judgement of friends (Ne. and Her.), and 'the all-conquering divinity who brought these things to fulfilment' – probably a reference to Zeus (cf. 680 παγκρατῆς Κρόνου παῖς, 1415), though Phil. does not name him and speaks only of ὁ πανδαμάτωρ δαίμων. Here as elsewhere in Soph. it is impossible to be certain of the relationship between *daimōn* and Zeus. Cf. Budelmann 2000: 148–54 on *OC* 1480–5, 1370–82, and 1748–50, all passages that name both Zeus and *daimōn* without clarifying their respective roles in human

affairs. For the supreme power of Zeus, cf. *Ant.* 604-10 τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἄν- | δρῶν ὑπερβασία κατὰσχοι; | ... | ... ἀγήρως δὲ χρόνῳι δυνάστας | κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου | μαρμαρόεσσας ἀγλάν. For the cooperation of Zeus and Moira, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 1045-6 Ζεὺς παντόπτας | οὕτω Μοῖρά τε συγκατέβα, Eur. *El.* 1247-8 τάντεῦθεν δὲ χρῆ | πράσσειν ἃ Μοῖρα Ζεὺς τ' ἔκρανε σοῦ πέρι. **πανδαμάτωρ**: elsewhere in archaic and classical Greek literature, **πανδαμάτωρ** is an epithet only of Sleep (*Il.* 24.5, *Od.* 9.373) and Time (Bacchyl. 12.205, Simon. 531.5). **ἐπέκραναν**: **ἐπικραίνω** 'bring to pass', 'fulfil' is an epic word that is common in Aesch. (14x), occurs only here in Soph., and is not found in Eur.

1469-71 χωρῶμεν... ἰκέσθαι: after remaining silent since 1221, the Chorus Leader or, perhaps, the Chorus in unison chant the final lines of the play. Choral anapaests conclude all the surviving plays of Soph., with the exception of *OT*, where the Chorus speak in trochaic tetrameters (though many scholars consider this ending to be corrupt and hypothesize that an anapaestic close has been lost). Choral anapaests, however brief, also conclude all the surviving plays of Eur., except for *Ion*, which ends in choral trochaic tetrameters; *Trö.*, which ends in choral lyrics, in accordance with the emotional intensity of the Chorus' response to the total destruction of their city; and possibly *IA* (the ending transmitted in the MSS is not genuine). Of the seven surviving plays by Aesch., only *Cho.* and *PV* definitely end with choral anapaests. *Ag.* concludes with character-dialogue in tetrameters and *Pers.*, *Supp.*, and *Eum.* with choral lyrics (part of a *kommos* or a processional); the metre at the end of *Sept.* is uncertain. Cf. Griffith 1977: 112-14.

1469 χωρῶμεν... ἀολλεῖς 'let us now go all together'. **χωρῶμεν** is hortatory subjunct. (Smyth 1797a, Moorhouse 222-3), and **δὲ** is emphatic, as it often is with imperatives or jussive subjunctives (cf. Eur. *Held.* 344 ἐζώμεσθα δὲ, *GP* 218). **ἀολλεῖς** is an epic word found elsewhere in Soph. only at *Tr.* 513 (in an epic context, when the Chorus sing of spectators coming together to watch the combat between Herakles and Achelōös) and in the one-word fr. 1017; it does not occur in Aesch. or Eur. By **ἀολλεῖς**, the Chorus mean themselves, Phil., and Ne. There is no indication that they include Od., or that he is in any way part of the play's harmonious ending. See *Intro.*, p. 20.

1470-1 Νύμφαις... ἰκέσθαι: the sea Nymphs are the Nereids, some of whose names in the Hesiodic catalogue (*Th.* 243-64) suggest that they were imagined as helping sailors to cross the sea: cf. 247 Εὐλιμένη, 248 Φέρουσα, 252-4 Κυμαδόκη... ἡ κύματ' ἐν ἡεροιδέϊ πόντῳ | πνοιᾶς τε ζαέων ἀνέμων σύν Κυματολήγη | ρεῖα πρηθνεῖ, 256 Ποντοπόρεια. Cf. Sappho 5.1-2 Κύπρι καὶ Νηρήϊδες ἀβλάβην μοι | τὸν κασιγνητὸν δότε τυῖδ' ἰκέσθαι. The subj. of ἰκέσθαι in the indir. discourse introduced by **ἐπευξάμενοι** is αὐτὰς - understood from **Νύμφαις** - with which **σωτήρας** agrees as pred. adj. For the masc. form with the fem. noun, cf. *OT* 80-1 εἰ γὰρ ἐν τύχηι γε τῷ | σωτῆρι βαίῃ λαμπρός,

Aesch. *Ag.* 664 τύχη... σωτήρ, *Supp.* 1040 θέλκτορι Πειθοῖ. This is the final expression of the play's continuing theme of 'salvation'; cf. 109n., *Introd.*, pp. 12, 28. νόστου: for the sailors and Ne., who have come from Troy, a voyage there may be thought of as a 'return homeward'. It is, however, harder to say in what sense it is a 'return home' for Phil., who has never been there, though he is returning to his 'home' community – the Greek army – and there may be an implication that if Phil. is persuaded to go to Troy, he will subsequently return home. Cf. 517, 721–9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AC</i>	<i>L'Antiquité classique</i>
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>APGRD</i>	<i>Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
<i>BIFG</i>	<i>Bollettino dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell'Università di Padova</i>
<i>ClAnt</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>CCJ</i>	<i>The Cambridge Classical Journal</i>
<i>C&M</i>	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>
<i>G&R</i>	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>HSPH</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>ICS</i>	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i>
<i>MD</i>	<i>Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici</i>
<i>PCPhS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PP</i>	<i>La Parola del passato</i>
<i>QUCC</i>	<i>Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne</i>
<i>SCO</i>	<i>Studi classici e orientali</i>
<i>SemRom</i>	<i>Seminari romani di cultura greca</i>
<i>SIFC</i>	<i>Studi italiani di filologia classica</i>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>UCPCP</i>	<i>University of California Publications in Classical Philology</i>
<i>WJA</i>	<i>Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>WS</i>	<i>Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik und lateinische Tradition</i>

EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES CITED AND CONSULTED

The following editions and commentaries are referred to by the editor's name only.

- Avezzù, G. *et al.* (2003) *Sofocle, Filottete*, Testo critico a cura di G. Avezzù, Introduzione e commento di P. Pucci, Traduzione di G. Cerri. Milan
(2008) *Sofocle, Edipo a Colono*, Testo critico a cura di G. Avezzù, Introduzione e commento di G. Guidorizzi, Traduzione di G. Cerri. Milan
- Barrett, W. (1964) *Euripides, Hippolytos*. Oxford
- Bernabé, A. (1987) *Poetae Epici Graeci: testimonia et fragmenta*, pars 1. Stuttgart and Leipzig, corr. 1996
- Bond, G. (1981) *Euripides, Heracles*. Oxford
- Brunck, P. *et al.* (1820) *Sophoclis tragoediae septem et deperditarum fragmenta... cum annotatione integra Brunckii et Schaefferi... Accedunt notae C.G.A. Erfurdii*, 3 vols. Oxford; Brunck's 1st edn, Strasbourg 1786
- Campbell, L. (1881) *Sophocles*, vol. II (*Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, Philoctetes*, Fragments). Oxford
- Collard, C. (1975) *Euripides, Supplices*, 2 vols. Groningen
- Collard, C. and M. Cropp (2008) *Euripides, Fragments: Oedipus-Chrysippus, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J. and J. Gibert (2004) *Euripides, Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. II. Warminster
- Dain, A. (2002) *Sophocle, tragédies*, t. 3 (*Philoctète-Oedipe à Colone*), 6th edn, texte établi par A. Dain, traduit par P. Mazon. Paris
- Dawe, R. D. (1996) *Sophocles, Philoctetes*, 3rd edn. Stuttgart and Leipzig
(2006) *Sophocles, Oedipus Rex*, 2nd edn. Cambridge
- Denniston, J. D. (1939) *Euripides, Electra*. Oxford
- Di Benedetto, V. *et al.* (2006) *Sofocle, Trachinie, Filottete*, Introduzione di V. di Benedetto, Premessa al testo e note di M. S. Mirto, Traduzione di M. P. Pattoni, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 6th edn. Milan
- Diggle, J. (1981-94) *Euripidis fabulae*, 3 vols. Oxford
- Dodds, E. R. (1959) *Plato, Gorgias*. Oxford
(1960) *Euripides, Bacchae*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Easterling, P. E. (1982) *Sophocles, Trachiniae*. Cambridge
- Elmsley, P. (1818) *Euripidis Medea*. Oxford
(1827) *Sophoclis tragoediae septem... emendatae cum annotatione tantum non integra Brunckii et Schaefferi... Leipzig*
- Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, 3 vols. Oxford, corr. 1962
(1977) *Due seminari romani di Eduard Fraenkel. Aiace e Filottete di Sofocle*, a cura di alcuni partecipanti. Rome
- Frazer, J. G. (1921) *Apollodoros: the Library*, 2 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., and London

- Friis Johansen, H. and E. W. Whittle (1980) *Aeschylus, The Suppliants*, 3 vols. Copenhagen
- Furley, W. D. and J. M. Bremer (2001) *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Tübingen
- Garvie, A. F. (1986) *Aeschylus, Choephoroi*. Oxford
- (2009) *Aeschylus, Persae*. Oxford
- Gentili, B., Bernardini, P. A., Cingano, E. and P. Giannini (2000) *Pindaro: le Pitiche*, 3rd edn. Milan
- Griffith, M. (1983) *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge
- (1999) *Sophocles, Antigone*. Cambridge
- Hermann, G. (1825) *Sophoclis Philoctetes*. London
- Janz, T. (2005) 'Scholia in Sophoclis Philoctetam', Ph.D. diss. Oxford
- Jebb, R. C. (1893–1900) *Sophocles: the Plays and Fragments: Ajax* (1896), *Antigone*, 3rd edn (1900), *Electra* (1894), *Oedipus Coloneus*, 3rd edn (1900), *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 3rd edn (1893), *Philoctetes*, 2nd edn (1898), *Trachiniae* (1894). Cambridge
- Jouan, F. and F. van Looy (2002) *Euripide, t. 8, 3^e partie, Fragments: Sthénébée-Chrysis*. Paris
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1980) *The Plays of Sophocles, VI: The Philoctetes*. Leiden
- Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad: a commentary, volume I, Books 1–4*. Cambridge
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994–6) *Sophocles*, 3 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass. and London)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and N. G. Wilson (1990a) *Sophoclis fabulae*. Oxford, corr. 1992
- Mastronarde, D. J. (1994) *Euripides, Phoenissae*. Cambridge
- (2002) *Euripides, Medea*. Cambridge
- Merkelbach, R. and M. L. West (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodae*. Oxford
- Most, G. (2007) *Hesiod, The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Müller, C. W. (2000) *Euripides, Philoktet: Testimonien und Fragmente*, Texte und Kommentare, 21. Berlin and New York
- Murray, G. (1955) *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Paduano, G. (1982) *Tragedie e frammenti di Sofocle*, vol. II. Turin
- Page, D. L. (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford
- (1972) *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae*. Oxford
- (1975) *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford
- Paley, F. A. (1880) *Sophocles*, vol. II. London
- Papageorgius, P. N. (1888) *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera*. Leipzig
- Pearson, A. C. (1917) *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 3 vols. Cambridge
- (1924) *Sophoclis fabulae*. Oxford
- Porson, R. (1829) *Euripidis tragoediae priores quatuor . . . ed. Ricardus Porson, recensuit . . . Jacobus Scholfield*, 2nd edn. Cambridge; Porson's first edn, 1802
- Powell, I. U. (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford
- Pucci, P. (2003) *Sofocle, Filottete*. Testo critico a cura di G. Avezzi, Introduzione e commento di P. Pucci, Traduzione di G. Cerri. Milan

- Radermacher, L. (1911) *Sophokles erklärt* von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck, Siebentes Bandchen, *Philoktetes*, besorgt von L. Radermacher. Berlin
- Ribbeck, O. (1871) *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, vol. 1., 2nd edn. Leipzig
- Seaford, R. (1984) *Euripides, Cyclops*. Oxford
- Snell, B. and H. Maehler (1971–5) *Pindarus*, 2 vols. Leipzig
- Sommerstein, A. (1989) *Aeschylus, Eumenides*. Cambridge
(2008) *Aeschylus*, 3 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Stevens, P. T. (1971) *Euripides, Andromache*. Oxford
- Ussher, R. G. (1990) *Sophocles, Philoctetes*. Warminster
- Viansino, G. (1963) *Sofocle, Filottete*. Turin
- Voigt, E.-M. (1971) *Sappho & Alcaeus: fragmenta*. Amsterdam
- Warmington, E. H. (1936) *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1970) *Sophocles, Philoctetes*. Cambridge
- West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod, Theogony*. Oxford
(1990) *Aeschylus, Tragoediae*. Stuttgart
(1998) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols. in 1, 2nd edn corr. Oxford
(2003) *Greek Epic Fragments*, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Willink, C. (1986) *Euripides, Orestes*. Oxford
- Wilson, N. G. (2007) *Aristophanis fabulae*, 2 vols. Oxford
- Wunder, E. and N. Wecklein (1875) *Sophoclis Tragoediae recensuit et explanavit E. Wunderus, Vol. 1, Sect. 1 continens Philoctetam, Editio Quarta quam curavit N. Wecklein*. Leipzig; first edn, 1831

**BOOKS AND ARTICLES CITED AND CONSULTED
(NOT INCLUDING SCHOLARS MENTIONED
ONLY AS PROPOSERS OF EMENDATIONS
OR DELETIONS)**

- Adams, G. (1729) *The tragedies of Sophocles, translated from the Greek. With notes historical, moral, and critical*. 2 vols. London
- Alessandri, A. (2009) *Mito e memoria: Filottete nell'immaginario occidentale*. Rome
- Alessandri, A. and M. Massenzio (2009) *Filottete: variazioni sul mito*. Venice
- Allen, W. S. (1973) *Accent and rhythm. Prosodic features of Latin and Greek: a study in theory and reconstruction*. Cambridge
(1984) *Vox Graeca: the pronunciation of classical Greek*, 3rd edn. Cambridge
- Alt, K. (1961) 'Schicksal und Physis im Philoktetes des Sophokles,' *Hermes* 89: 141–74
(reprinted in H. Diller, hrsg., *Sophokles. Wege der Forschung*, 95. Darmstadt, 1967: 412–59)
- Andrén, A. (1952) 'Il torso del Belvedere', in *Opuscula Archaeologica. Institutum Romanum Regni Sueciae* 7: 1–45

- Angelleli, M. (1823) *Sofocle, Tragedie*. Bologna
- Austin, N. (2006) 'The great soul robbery in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Arion* 14: 69–118
 (2011) *Sophocles' Philoctetes and the great soul robbery*. Madison
- Avery, H. (1965) 'Heracles, Philoctetes, Neoptolemus', *Hermes* 93: 279–97
 (2002) 'One ship or two at Lemnos?', *CP* 97: 1–20
- Avezzù, G. (1974) 'Per una ricerca sull'uso di ripetizioni nei tragici', *BIFG* 1: 54–69
 (1987) 'Filottete sulla scena antica e moderna. A proposito d'una recente raccolta', *MD* 19: 131–42
 (1988) *Il ferimento e il rito: La storia di Filottete sulla scena attica*, Studi e commenti, 7. Bari
- Barrett, J. (2002) *Staged narrative: poetics and the messenger in Greek tragedy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London
- Barrett, W. S. (2007) *Greek lyric, tragedy, & textual criticism: collected papers*. Oxford
- Belfiore, E. (1994) 'Xenia in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *CJ* 89: 113–29
- Benardete, S. (1965) 'XPH and ΔΕΙ in Plato and others', *Glotta* 43: 285–98
 (2003) 'The plan of Odysseus and the plot of the *Philoctetes*', *Epoché* 7: 133–50
- Benveniste, E. (1973) *Indo-European language and society*, translated by E. Palmer, Miami Linguistics Series, 12, Coral Gables (originally published as *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1969)
- Bers, V. (1981) 'The perjured chorus in Sophocles' "*Philoctetes*", *Hermes* 109: 500–4
 (1984) *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*. New Haven and London
 (1997) *Speech in speech: studies in incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic drama and oratory*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, London
- Beye, C. R. (1970) 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the Homeric embassy', *TAPhA* 101: 63–75
- Bieler, L. (1951) 'A political slogan in ancient Athens', *AJPh* 72: 181–4
- Biggs, P. (1966) 'The disease theme in Sophocles' *Ajax*, *Philoctetes* and *Trachiniae*', *CP* 61: 223–35
- Björck, G. (1950) *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache: attische Wort- und Stilstudien*. Uppsala
- Blaydes, F. H. M. (1899) *Adversaria critica in Sophoclem*. Halle
- Blundell, M. W. (1987) 'The moral character of Odysseus in *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 27: 307–29
 (1988) 'The *phusis* of Neoptolemos in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *G&R* 35: 137–48 (reprinted in I. McAuslan and P. Walcott, eds., *Greek tragedy*. Oxford, 1993: 104–15)
 (1989) *Helping friends and harming enemies: a study in Sophocles and Greek ethics*. Cambridge
- Bonaria, M. (1991) 'L'antilabé nella tragedia greca antica', in *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco*, I. Palermo: 173–88

- Borgards, R. (2002) 'Herders Philoktet. Schmerz zwischen Physiologie und Ästhetik', in P. Andraschke and H. Loos, eds., *Ideen und ideale. Johann Gottfried Herder in Ost und West*. Freiburg: 89–121
- Bowersock, G. (1994) 'The wounded savior', in *Fiction as history: Nero to Julian*. Sather classical lectures, 58. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: 55–76
- Bowie, A. M. (1997) 'Tragic filters for history: Euripides' *Suppliants* and Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', in C. Pelling, ed., *Greek tragedy and the historian*, Oxford: 39–62
- Bowra, C. M. (1944) *Sophoclean tragedy*. Oxford
- Brillante, C. (2009) 'Elementi tradizionali, riprese e innovazioni Sofoclee', *QUCC* 93: 49–77
- Brumoy, P. and C. Lennox (trans.) (1759) *The Greek theatre of Father Brumoy*. 3 vols. London (Originally published in 1730 as *Le théâtre des Grecs*. 3 vols.) Paris
- Budelmann, F. (2000) *The language of Sophocles: communality, communication and involvement*. Cambridge
- (2006) 'Körper und Geist in tragischen Schmerz-Szenen', in B. Seidensticker and M. Vöhler, eds., *Darstellung in der griechischen Klassik*. Berlin and New York: 123–48
- (2007) 'The reception of Sophocles' representation of physical pain', *AJPh* 128: 443–67
- Buijs, J. A. J. M. (1986) 'Thematic associations of aeolic metre in Sophocles' "Philoktetes" and the text of 1213–7', *Mnemosyne* 39: 125–8
- Burkert, W. (1955) *Zum altgriechischen Mitleidsbegriff*. Erlangen
- (1970) 'Jason, Hypsipyle and new fire at Lemnos. A study in myth and ritual', *CQ* 20: 1–16
- (1985) *Greek religion*, trans. J. Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burton, R. W. B. (1980) *The chorus in Sophocles' tragedies*. Oxford
- Butlin, M. (1981) *The paintings and drawings of William Blake*, 2 vols. New Haven and London
- Buxton, R. G. A. (1982) *Persuasion in Greek tragedy: a study of Peitho*. Cambridge
- (2006) 'Weapons and day's white horses: the language of Ajax', in De Jong and Rijksbaron 2006: 13–24
- Calder, W. M., III. (1971) 'Sophoclean apologia: *Philoktetes*', *GRBS* 12: 153–74
- Campbell, C. (1972) 'A Theophany', *Theoria to Theory* 6: 81–5
- Campbell, L. (1907) *Paralipomena Sophoclea: supplementary notes on the text and interpretation of Sophocles*. Oxford, repr. Hildesheim, 1969
- Carlevale, J. (2000) 'Education, *physis*, and freedom in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *Arion* 8: 26–60
- Catoni, M. L. (2005) *Schemata: comunicazione non verbale nella Grecia antica. Gli schemata nella danza, nell' arte, nella vita*. Studi 2. Pisa
- Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Collection linguistique, 38. Paris
- Ciani, M. G. (1981) 'Filottete delle Galassie', *Sigma* 14: 15–25

- Cicellis, K. (1960) *The way to Colonus. A Greek triptych*. New York
- Collard, C. (2005) 'Colloquial language in tragedy: a supplement to the work of P. T. Stevens', *CQ* 55: 350–86
- Craik, E. M. (1979) 'Philoktetes: Sophoklean melodrama', *AC* 48: 15–29
- Csapo, E. and W. J. Slater (1994) *The context of ancient drama*. Ann Arbor
- Dale, A. M. (1956) 'Seen and unseen on the Greek stage', *WS* 69: 96–106 (reprinted in *Collected papers*. Cambridge, 1969: 119–29)
- (1968) *The lyric metres of Greek drama*. 2nd edn. Cambridge
- (1981–3) *Metrical analyses of tragic choruses*, *BICS* Suppl. 21.2–3. London
- Daly, J. (1982) 'The name of Philoktetes: *Philoktetes* 670–73', *AJPh* 103: 440–2
- Davidson, J. F. (1990) 'The cave of Philoktetes', *Mnemosyne* 43: 307–15
- (1995) 'Homer and Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', in A. Griffiths, ed., *Stage directions: essays in honour of E. W. Handley*, *BICS* Suppl. 66. London: 25–35
- (2001) 'Sophocles' *Philoktetes*: the encounter of the generations', *WJA* 25: 27–39
- (2002) 'Arrival at the cave: the Odyssey and Greek drama', *WS* 115: 45–57
- Davies, M. (2003) 'Philoktetes: wild man and helper figure', *PP* 58: 347–55
- Dawe, R. D. (1973–8) *Studies on the text of Sophocles*, 3 vols. Leiden
- De Jong, I. J. F. and A. Rijksbaron (eds.) (2006) *Sophocles and the Greek language: aspects of diction, syntax and pragmatics*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl., 269. Leiden and Boston
- Denniston, J. D. (1929) 'Four notes on Greek particles', *CR* 43: 118–19
- De Tabley, J. B. L. W. (1903) *The collected poems of Lord de Tabley*. London
- Di Benedetto, V. (1983) *Sofocle*. Florence
- Di Benedetto, V. and E. Medda (1997) *La tragedia sulla scena: la tragedia greca in quanto spettacolo teatrale*. Turin
- Diderot, D. (1959) *Œuvres esthétiques*, ed. P. Vernière. Paris
- Diggle, J. (1981) *Studies on the text of Euripides*. Oxford
- Dik, H. (2007) *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford
- Eagleton, T. (2003) *Sweet violence: the idea of the tragic*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.
- Easterling, P. E. (1973) 'Repetition in Sophocles', *Hermes* 101: 14–34
- (1978) 'Philoktetes and modern criticism', *JCS* 3: 27–39
- (1985) 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105: 1–10
- (ed.) (1997a) *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy*. Cambridge
- (1997b) 'Form and performance', in Easterling 1997a: 151–77
- (1999) 'Plain words in Sophocles', in Griffin 1999: 95–107
- Elliger, W. (1975) *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte*, 15. Berlin
- Encinas Reguero, M. C. (2011) 'Los límites del *dolos* en el *Philoktetes* de Sófocles', in M. Quijada Sagredo, ed., *Estudios sobre tragedia griega: Eurípides, el teatro griego de finales del s.V a.C. y su influencia*. Madrid: 83–104
- Falkner, T. (1998) 'Containing tragedy: rhetoric and self-representation in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *CLAnt* 17: 25–58
- Farnell, L. R. (1921) *Greek hero cults and ideas of immortality*. Oxford

- Fénelon, F. de (1994) *Telemachus, son of Ulysses*, edited and translated by P. Riley. Cambridge
- (1997) *Œuvres*, ed. J. J. Le Brun, vol. II. Paris
- Ferrari, F. (1983) *Ricerche sul testo di Sofocle*. Pisa
- Fiehn, K. (1938) 'Philoktetes', *RE* 19.2: 2500–9
- Finglass, P. J. (2006) 'The hero's quest in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *Prometheus* 32: 217–24
- (2009a) 'Two amputations in Sophocles', *MD* 62: 223–30
- (2009b) 'Unpublished conjectures at Leiden on the Greek dramatists', *GRBS* 49: 187–221
- (2011) 'Unpublished conjectures on Sophocles by Jeremiah Markland', *GRBS* 51: 232–8
- Flashar, H. (1999) 'Ergänzenden Notizen zum "Philoktet" des Sophokles', in H. Flashar, ed., *Sophokles Philoktet: Übertragen von Wolfgang Schadewaldt*. Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig: 89–92
- (2000) *Sophokles: Dichter im demokratischen Athen*. Munich
- Flashar, M. (1999) 'Antike und neuzeitliche Bilder von Philoktet', in H. Flashar, ed., *Sophokles Philoktet: Übertragen von Wolfgang Schadewaldt*. Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig: 139–75
- Ford, A. (2006) 'The genre of genres: paeans and *paian* in early Greek poetry', *Poetica* 38: 277–96
- Fornaro, S. (ed.) (2006) *Johann Gottfried Herder: Filottete*. Venosa
- Fränkel, H. (1975) *Early Greek poetry and philosophy: a history of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century*, translated by M. Hadas and J. Willis. Oxford (originally published as *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, New York, 1951; 3rd edn, Munich, 1969)
- Frame, D. (1978) *The myth of return in early Greek epic*. New Haven and London
- Franken, L. (1999) 'The wound of the serpent: the Philoktetes story in *The Mill on the Floss*', *Comparative Literature Studies* 36: 24–44
- Freidenberg, O. M. (1997) *Image and concept: mythopoetic roots of literature. Sign/text/culture: studies in Slavic and comparative semiotics*, 2. Amsterdam
- Friis-Johansen, H. (1959) *General reflection in tragic rhesis: a study of form*. Copenhagen
- Fritz, K. von (1943) 'ΝΟΥΣ and ΝΟΕΙΝ in the Homeric poems', *CP* 38: 79–93
- Fulkerson, L. (2006) 'Neoptolemus grows up? "Moral development" and the interpretation of Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *PCPhS* 52: 49–61
- Fuqua, C. (1976) 'Studies in the use of myth in Sophocles' "Philoktetes" and the "Orestes" of Euripides', *Traditio* 32: 29–95
- Fusillo, M. (1990) 'Lo spazio di Filottete (per una poetica della scena sofoclea)', *SIFC* 8: 19–59
- Gaier, U. (ed.) (1985) *Johann Gottfried Herder: frühe Schriften 1764–1772*. Frankfurt-am-Main
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*. Baltimore and London

- Gardiner, C. P. (1987) *The Sophoclean chorus: a study of character and function*. Iowa City
- Garvie, A. (1969) *Aeschylus' Suppliants: play and trilogy*. Cambridge
- (1972) 'Deceit, violence, and persuasion in the *Philoctetes*', in *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella*, Facoltà di lettere e Filosofia. Catania: 213–26.
- Genière, J. de la (ed.) (1991) *Épéios et Philoctète en Italie: données archéologiques et traditions légendaires*. Cahiers du centre Jean Bérard, 16. Naples
- Giangiulio, M. (1991) 'Filottete tra Sibari e Crotone. Osservazioni sulla tradizione letteraria', in Genière, 1991: 37–53
- Gibert, J. (1995) *Change of mind in Greek tragedy*, Hypomnemata, 108. Göttingen
- Gide, A. (1941) *Le retour de l'enfant prodigue, précédé de cinq autres traités*. Paris
- Gill, C. (1980) 'Bow, oracle and epiphany in Sophocles' "*Philoctetes*", *G&R* 27: 137–46
- Goldhill, S. (2009) 'Undoing in Sophoclean drama: *lusis* and the analysis of irony', *TAPhA* 139: 21–52
- (2012) *Sophocles and the language of tragedy*. Oxford and New York
- Goldhill, S. and E. Hall (eds.) (2009) *Sophocles and the Greek tragic tradition*. Cambridge
- Goodman, P. (1962) *The Lordly Hudson. Collected poems*. New York
- Gould, J. (2001) 'Hikeieia', in *Myth, ritual memory, and exchange: essays in Greek literature and culture*. Oxford: 22–77 (originally published in *JHS* 93 (1973): 74–103)
- Greengard, C. (1987) *Theatre in crisis: Sophocles' reconstruction of genre and politics in Philoctetes*. Amsterdam
- Greenwood, E. (2006) *Thucydides and the shaping of history*. London
- (2010) *Afro-Greeks: dialogues between anglophone Caribbean literature and Classics in the twentieth century*. Oxford
- Greene, D. (1967) *Reality and the heroic pattern: last plays of Ibsen, Shakespeare, and Sophocles*. Chicago and London
- Griffin, J. (ed.) (1999) *Sophocles revisited: essays presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The authenticity of Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge
- Hahnemann, C. (2011) 'Non-natural pairs: meaningful duals in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association, San Antonio, Texas, 9 January
- Haldane, J. A. (1963) 'A paeon in the *Philoctetes*', *CQ* n.s. 13: 53–6
- Hall, E. (2006) 'Singing roles in tragedy', in *The theatrical cast of Athens: interactions between ancient Greek drama and society*, Oxford: 288–320
- (2008) 'Navigating the realms of gold: translation as access route to the classics', in A. Lianeri and V. Zajko, eds., *Translation and the classics*. Oxford: 315–40
- (2012) 'Ancient Greek responses to suffering: thinking with *Philoctetes*', in J. Malpas and N. Liskis, eds., *Perspectives on human suffering*. Dordrecht: 155–69
- Hall, E. and F. Macintosh (2005) *Greek tragedy and the British theatre*. Oxford
- Hamilton, R. (1975) 'Neoptolemos' story in the *Philoctetes*', *AJPh* 96: 131–7
- Handley, E. W. (1954) '-sis nouns in Aristophanes', *Eranos* 51: 129–42

- Hardwick, L. (2003) *Reception studies. Greece & Rome* New Surveys in the Classics, 10. Oxford
- Harrison, S. J. (1989) 'Sophocles and the cult of Philoctetes', *JHS* 109: 173–5
- Hawkins, A. H. (1999) 'Ethical tragedy in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *CW* 92: 337–57
- Hawthorne, K. (2006) 'Political discourses at the end of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *ClAnt* 25: 243–76
- Heaney, S. (1990) *The cure at Troy: a version of Sophocles' Philoctetes*. London
- Herder, J. G. (1882) *Sämmtliche Werke*, Bd. 26, ed. B. Suphan. Berlin
- (1993) *Schriften zur Ästhetik und Literatur 1767–1772*, ed. G. E. Grimm. Frankfurt am Main
- Hesk, J. (2000) *Deception and democracy in classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Hinds, A. E. (1967) 'The prophecy of Helenus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *CQ* 17: 169–80
- Holt, P. (1986) 'Herakles in armor: *Philoctetes* v. 727', *AC* 55: 302–7
- Hooker, E. M. (1950) 'The sanctuary and altar of Chryse in Attic red-figure vase-paintings of the late fifth and early fourth centuries BC', *JHS* 70: 35–41
- Hopkinson, N. (1982) 'Juxtaposed prosodic variants in Greek and Latin poetry', *Glotta* 60: 162–77
- Hoppin, M. C. (1981) 'What happens in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*?', *Traditio* 37: 1–30
- (1990) 'Metrical effects, dramatic illusion, and the two endings of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Arethusa* 23: 141–82
- Horrocks, G. (1997) *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*. London and New York
- Hose, M. (2008) 'Philoctet: von der Schwierigkeit der Wiedereingliederung', *Philologos* 152: 27–39
- Hunter, R. (2009) *Critical moments in classical literature: studies in the ancient view of literature and its uses*. Cambridge
- Ipius, P. [Ἡπῆτης, Π.] (1818) 'Ἐντιμολογιώτατε Κύριε Γεώργιε Τακτικῆ!', *ΕΡΜΗΣ ὁ ΛΟΓΙΟΣ* 7: 575–88
- Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia Scaenica*. Oxford Classical and Philological Monographs. Oxford
- Jameson, M. H. (1956) 'Politics and the *Philoctetes*', *CP* 51: 217–27
- Johnson, J. A. (1988) 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes*: deictic language and the claims of Odysseus', *Eranos* 86: 117–21
- Jouanna, J. (1983) 'Le sommeil médecin (Sophocle, *Philoctète* v. 859 ἀλεῖς ὕπνος)', in *Théâtre et spectacles dans l'antiquité: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 5–7 novembre 1981*. Leiden: 49–62
- (2004) 'Sémantique et temporalité tragique: remarques sur le sens de παλαιός et πάλαι à partir du *Philoctète* de Sophocle', *REG* 117: 21–36
- Kaimio, M. (1988) *Physical contact in Greek tragedy: a study of stage conventions*. Helsinki
- Käppel, L. (1992) *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Berlin
- Kastely, J. L. (1997) 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the crisis of rhetoric', in *Rethinking the rhetorical tradition*. New Haven and London: 79–113

- Kiefer, J. S. (1942) 'Philoctetes and arete', *CP* 37: 38–50
- King, K. C. (1987) *Achilles: paradigms of the war hero from Homer to the Middle Ages*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1954) 'The dramatic role of the chorus in Sophocles', *Phoenix* 8: 1–22
- (1958) *A study of Sophoclean drama*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 31. Ithaca, New York
- (1994) 'Persuasion and allusion in Sophocles' "Philoctetes"', *Hermes* 122: 425–36
- Kittmer, J. (1995) 'Sophoclean statistics: a reading of *Philoctetes*', *MD* 34: 9–35
- Kitto, H. D. F. (1939) 'Sophocles, statistics, and the *Trachiniae*', *AJPh* 60: 178–93
- (1956) *Form and meaning in drama*. London
- Kitzinger, M. R. (2008) *The choruses of Sophocles' Antigone and Philoktetes: a dance of words*, Mnemosyne Suppl., 292. Leiden and Boston
- Klimatiotis, Th. [Κλημισιώτης, Θ.] (1819) 'Πρὸς τὸν Κύριον Χρόνια Ἰωάννου Δροσινῶν', *ΕΡΜΗΣ ὁ ΛΟΓΙΟΣ* 8: 358–60
- Knox, B. M. W. (1964) *The heroic temper: studies in Sophoclean tragedy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London
- Korzeniewski, U. (2003) *Sophokles! Die Alten! Philoktet! Lessing und die antiken Dramatiker*. Konstanz
- Kosak, J. C. (1999) 'Therapeutic touch and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *HSPH* 99: 93–134
- Kott, J. (1974) *The eating of the gods. An interpretation of Greek tragedy*. London
- Kranz, W. (1933) *Stasimon: Untersuchungen zur Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie*. Berlin
- Krechel, A. (2009) *Voices from the bitter core*, trans. A. K. Strawser. Austin
- Lada-Richards, I. (1998) 'Staging the ephebeia: theatrical role-playing and ritual transition in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Ramus* 27: 1–26
- (2009) "'The players will tell all": the dramatist, the actors and the art of acting in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', in Goldhill and Hall 2009: 48–69
- Lancaster, H. C. (1953) *French tragedy in the reign of Louis XVI and the early years of the French Revolution, 1774–1792*. Baltimore
- Lattimore, S. (1998) *Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War*, translated with introduction and notes. Indianapolis and Cambridge, Mass.
- Lebeau le cadet, M. (1770) 'Mémoires sur les tragiques grecs', *Mémoires de littérature, tirés des registres de l'Académie royale des inscriptions et belles lettres*, 35. Paris: 432–74
- Lefèvre, E. (2012) *PHILOKTETES—Wandlungen der Sophokles- Tragödie im 20. Jahrhundert. 13 Dramen von André Gide bis Jean Siméon*. Freiburg
- Lessing, G. E. (1984) *Laocoon: an essay on the limits of painting and poetry*, trans. E. A. McCormick. Baltimore and London
- (1990) *Werke 1766–1769*, ed. W. Barner. Frankfurt am Main
- Levine, D. B. (2003) 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and *Odyssey* 9: Odysseus versus the cave man', *Scholía* 12: 3–26

- Ley, G. and M. Evans (1985) 'The orchestra as acting area in Greek tragedy', *Ramus* 14: 75–84
- Linforth, I. M. (1956) 'Philoctetes: the play and the man', *UCPCP* 15: 95–156
- Lloyd, M. (1999) 'The tragic aorist', *CQ* 49: 24–45
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and N. G. Wilson (1990b) *Sophoclea: studies on the text of Sophocles*. Oxford
- (1997) *Sophocles: second thoughts*. Hypomnemata, 100. Göttingen
- Long, A. A. (1968) *Language and thought in Sophocles: a study of abstract nouns and poetic technique*. London
- Luzzatto, M. T. (1980) 'Sul Filottete di Eschilo', *SCO* 30: 97–122
- Lyles, A. and R. Hamlyn (1997) *British watercolours from the Oppé collection with a selection of drawings and oil sketches*, Exhibition catalogue, Tate Gallery. London
- Machin, A. (1981) *Cohérence et continuité dans le théâtre de Sophocle*. Quebec
- (1983) 'Hontes et refus chez le "Philoctète" de Sophocle', *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque*. Aix-en-Provence: 261–75
- Malkin, I. (1998a) 'The middle ground: Philoctetes in Italy', *Kernos* 11: 131–41
- (1998b) *The Returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London
- Mandel, O. (1981) *Philoctetes and the fall of Troy: plays, documents, iconography, interpretation*. Lincoln and London
- Martin, R. P. (1987) 'Fire on the mountain: *Lysistrata* and the Lemnian women', *CA* 6: 77–105
- (1989) *The Language of Achilles*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Martinelli, M. C. (1997) *Gli strumenti del poeta: elementi di metrica greca*, 2nd edn. Bologna
- Martini, L. (1974) *Fortuna neogreca del Filottete*. Padua
- Masaracchia, A. (1964) 'La scena dell' *ἑμπεδος* nel Filottete di Sofocle', *Maia* 16: 79–98 (reprinted in *Riflessioni sull'antico*. Pisa and Rome, 1998: 195–214, and in *Filottete*, traduzione di M. Boggio, A. Masaracchia, Passato e presente teatro, 8. Nardò 2004: 112–49)
- Masciadri, V. (2008) *Eine Insel im Meer der Geschichten: Untersuchungen zu Myth aus Lemnos*. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftlicher Beiträge, 18. Stuttgart
- Mastronarde, D. J. (1979) *Contact and discontinuity. Some connections of speech and action on the Greek stage*. University of California Publications: Classical Studies, 21. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- (1990) 'Actors on high: the skene roof, the crane, and the gods in Attic drama', *ClAnt* 9: 247–94
- Matthiessen, K. (1981) 'Philoktet oder die Resozialisierung', *WJA* 7: 11–26
- Mauduit, C. (1995) 'Les morts de Philoctète', *REG* 108: 339–70
- (1997) 'De Lemnos à Italie: remarques sur le mythe de Philoctète', in A. Billaut, ed., *Héros et voyageurs grecs dans l'occident romain*. Lyon: 9–32

- Maxwell-Stuart, P. G. (1981) *Studies in Greek colour terminology, Volume II: ΧΑΡΟΠΟΣ*. Mnemosyne Suppl., 67. Leiden.
- Medda, E. (1983) *La forma monologica: ricerche su Omero e Sofocle*. Studi di lettere, storia e filosofia pubblicati dalla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 35. Pisa
- Meiggs, R. (1972) *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford
- Meillet, A. (1975) *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque. Avec bibliographie mise à jour et complétée par O. Masson*, 8th edn. Études et commentaires, 55. Paris
- Michelakis, P. (2002) *Achilles in Greek tragedy*. Cambridge
- Milani, L. A. (1879) *Il mito di Filottete nella letteratura classica e nell'arte figurata*. Florence
- (1882) *Nuovi monumenti di Filottete e considerazioni generali in proposito*. Rome
- Miller, N. K. (1991) 'Philoctetes' sister: feminist literary criticism and the new misogyny', in *Getting personal: feminist occasions and other autobiographical acts*. New York and London: 100–21
- Minadeo, R. (1993) 'Theme and plot in the Philoctetes', *SIFC* 11: 87–105
- Mitchell-Boyask, R. (2007) 'The Athenian Asklepion and the end of the *Philoctetes*', *TAPhA* 137: 85–114
- Monsacré, H. (1984) *Les Larmes d'Achille: le héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère*. Paris
- Morin, B. (2003) 'L'épopée homérique au service du personnage tragique: Polyphème, Héphaïstos et Philoctète à Lemnos', *REG* 116: 386–417
- Mossman, J. (1999) *Wild justice: a study of Euripides' Hecuba*, 2nd edn. London
- Müller, C. W. (1997) *Philoktet: Beiträge zur Wiedergewinnung einer Tragödie des Euripides aus der Geschichte ihrer Rezeption*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 100. Stuttgart and Leipzig
- Müller, G. (1967) 'Chor und Handlung bei den griechischen Tragikern', in H. Diller, ed., *Sophokles*. Darmstadt: 212–38
- Müller, H. (1998) *Die Gedichte. Werke 1*, ed. F. Hörnigk. Frankfurt am Main
- (2000) *Philoktet*, in *Werke 3, Die Stücke 1*, ed. F. Hörnigk. Frankfurt am Main: 289–327
- (2003) *Filottete*. Genova
- (2011) *Three plays: Philoctetes, The Horatian, Mauser*, translated by N. McBride. London, New York and Calcutta
- Musti, D. (1991) 'Lo sviluppo del mito di Filottete da Crotone a Sibari: tradizioni Achee e Troiane in Magna Grecia', in Genière 1991: 21–35
- Newman, R. J. (1991) 'Heroic resolution: a note on Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 1405–1406', *CJ* 86: 305–10
- Nooter, S. (2012) *When heroes sing: Sophocles and the shifting soundscape of tragedy*. Cambridge
- Nuchelmans, J. C. F. (1949) *Die Nomina des sophokleischen Wortschatzes: Vorarbeiten zu einer sprachgeschichtlichen und stilistischen Analyse*. Utrecht
- Nussbaum, M. (1976–7) 'Consequences and character in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Philosophy and Literature* 1: 26–53

- (2008) 'The "morality of pity": Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', in R. Felski, ed., *Rethinking tragedy*. Baltimore and London: 148–69
- O'Higgins, D. (1991) 'Narrators and narrative in the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles', *Ramus* 20: 37–52
- O'Kell, E. (2000) 'Enter Odysseus: Greek theatrical conventions and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', in L. Hardwick, P. Easterling, S. Ireland, N. Lowe and F. Macintosh, eds., *Theatre: Ancient and modern* 1: 137–52. Online at <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/Conf99/Okell.htm>
- Olson, S. D. (1991) 'Politics and the lost Euripidean *Philoctetes*', *Hesperia* 60: 269–83
- Ondaatje, M. (1989) *The cinnamon peeler: selected poems*. New York
- Østerud, S. (1973) 'The intermezzo with the false merchant in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (542–627)', *C&M Dissertationes* 9: 10–26.
- Palmer, L. R. (1980) *The Greek language*. London and Boston
- Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian religion: a history*. Oxford
- (2005) *Polytheism and society at Athens*. Oxford
- Payne, M. E. (2000) 'Three double messenger scenes in Sophocles', *Mnemosyne* 53: 403–18
- Perrotta, G. (1935) *Sofocle*. Messina and Florence
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of classical scholarship: from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age*. Oxford
- Philp, R. H. (1958) 'Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 782', *CR* 8: 220
- Pipili, M. (1994) 'Philoctetes', *LIMC* vii.1: 176–88; plates: 321–6
- Podlecki, A. J. (1966) 'The power of the word in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 7: 233–50
- Poe, J. P. (1974) *Heroism and divine justice in Sophocles' Philoctetes*. *Mnemosyne Suppl.*, 34. Leiden
- Pohlenz, M. (1956) 'Furcht und Mitleid? Ein Nachwort', *Hermes* 84: 49–74
- Poole, A. (1987) *Tragedy: Shakespeare and the Greek example*. Oxford and New York
- Porson, R. (1815) *Tracts and miscellaneous criticism of the late Richard Porson*, ed. T. Kidd. London
- Potter, P. (1788) *The tragedies of Sophocles translated*. London
- Prauscello, L. (2010) 'The language of pity: *eleos* and *oiktos* in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *CCJ* 56: 199–210
- Psichari, J. (1908) 'Sophocle et Hippocrate: à propos du *Philoctète à Lemnos*', *RPh* 32: 95–128
- Quincey, J. H. (1966) 'Greek expressions of thanks', *JHS* 86: 133–58
- Ramazani, J. (1997) 'The wound of history: Walcott's *Omeros* and the postcolonial poetics of affliction', *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 112: 405–17
- Redlich, C. (ed.) (1884) *Herders poetische Werke*, Bd. 4. Berlin (= B. Suphan (ed.) *Herders Sämmtliche Werke*, Bd. 28)
- Reeve, M. D. (1973) 'Interpolations in Greek tragedy III', *GRBS* 14: 147–71

- Rehm, R. (2002) *The play of space: spatial transformation in Greek tragedy*. Princeton and Oxford
- (2003) *Radical tragedy*. London.
- Reinhardt, K. (1979) *Sophocles*, trans. H. Harvey and D. Harvey (translation of *Sophokles*, 3rd edn, 1947). Oxford
- Rehman, R. (1976) *Studies in Greek texts: Critical observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and other authors*. Hypomnemata, 43. Göttingen
- (1992) 'The new Oxford Sophocles', *CP* 87: 335–75
- Reverdin, O. and A. Rivier (eds.) (1960) *Euripide. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, t. 6. Vandoeuvres-Genève
- Rich, A. (1978) *The dream of a common language. Poems 1974–1977*. New York and London
- Rigo, G. (1996) *Sophocle. Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de fréquence*, Travaux publiés par le Centre Informatique de Philosophie et Lettres, Série du Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, Fascicule 25, Liège
- (1999) *Eschyle: Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de fréquence*, Travaux publiés par le Centre Informatique de Philosophie et Lettres, Série du Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, Fascicule 26, Liège
- (2005) *Euripide: Opera et fragmenta omnia: Index verborum, Listes de fréquence*, 2 vols., Travaux publiés par le Centre Informatique de Philosophie et Lettres, Série du Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, Fascicule 29, Liège
- Rijksbaron, A. (2006) 'On false historic presents in Sophocles (and Euripides)', in De Jong and Rijksbaron 2006: 127–49
- Ringer, M. (1998) *Electra and the empty urn: metatheater and role playing in Sophocles*. Chapel Hill and London
- Risch, E. (1974) *Wortbildung der homerische Sprache*, 2nd edn. Berlin
- Roberts, D. H. (1988) 'Sophoclean endings: another story', *Arethusa* 21: 177–96
- (1989) 'Different stories: Sophoclean narrative(s) in the *Philoctetes*', *TAPhA* 119: 161–76
- Robinson, D. B. (1969) 'Topics in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *CQ* n.s. 19: 34–56
- Robinson, M. (2013) 'Ways of hearing in Sophocles', Ph.D. diss. University of Toronto. Toronto
- Roisman, H. M. (1997) 'The appropriation of a son: Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 38: 127–71
- (2005) *Sophocles: Philoctetes*. London
- Romm, J. S. (1992) *The edges of the earth in ancient thought*. Princeton.
- Rose, P. W. (1976) 'Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the teachings of the Sophists', *HSPH* 80: 49–105 (revised in *Sons of the gods, children of the earth: ideology and literary form in ancient Greece*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1992: 266–330)

- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's paean: a reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre*. Oxford
- Rutherford, R. B. (2010) 'The Greek of Athenian tragedy, in E. Bakker, ed., *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*. Malden, Oxford and Chichester: 441-54
- (2012) *Greek tragic style: form, language, and interpretation*. Cambridge
- Ryzman, M. (1991) 'Neoptolemus' psychological crisis and the development of *physis* in Sophocles' *Philoketes*', *Eranos* 89: 35-41
- Scammacca, O. (1641) *Filottete, tragedia morale*, in *Delle tragedie sacre e morali*, vol. VIII, ed. D. P. Ragusa. Palermo
- Scarry, E. (1985) *The body in pain: the making and unmaking of the world*. Oxford
- Schadewaldt, W. (1926) *Monolog und Selbstgespräch: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie*, Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, 2. Berlin (unchanged reprint, Berlin, Zurich, Dublin 1966)
- Schein, S. L. (1979) *The iambic trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles: a study in metrical form*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 6. Leiden
- (1996) 'Introduction', in S. L. Schein, ed., *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretive essays*. Princeton: 3-31
- (1998) 'Verbal adjectives in Sophocles: necessity and morality', *CP* 93: 293-307
- (2001) 'Herakles and the ending of Sophocles' *Philoketes*', *SIFC* 19: 38-52
- (2002) 'Odysseus and the language of violence in Sophocles' *Philoketes*', *SIFC* 20: 45-9
- (2006a) 'The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Sophocles' *Philoketes*: generic complexity and ethical ambiguity', in J. Davidson, F. Muecke, and P. Wilson, eds., *Greek Drama III: Essays in honour of Kevin Lee*, *BICS* Suppl. 87. London: 129-40
- (2006b) 'Divine and human in Sophocles' *Philoketes*', in S. Oberhelmen and V. Pedrick, eds., *The soul of tragedy: essays on Athenian drama*. Chicago: 26-46
- (2011) 'Language and dramatic action in the prologue of Sophocles' *Philoketes*', *Dioniso* n.s. 1: 79-96
- Scheliha, R. von (1970) *Der Philoktet des Sophokles: ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der griechischen Ethos*. Amsterdam
- Schlesinger, E. (1968) 'Die Intrige im Aufbau von Sophokles' *Philoktet*', *RhM* 111: 98-157
- Schmid, W. (1934) *Die klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur* [= Schmid, W. and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 1.2]. Munich
- Schmidt, J.-U. (1973) *Sophokles, Philoktet: eine Strukturanalyse*. Heidelberg
- Schnebele, A. (1988) 'Die epischen Quellen des sophokleischen Philoktet. Die Postliaca im frühgriechischen Epos', Ph.D. diss. Tübingen
- Schröder, S. (1999) *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian: eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen*. Stuttgart and Leipzig

- Schulz, A. M. (1998) *Giammaria Mosca called Padovano: a Renaissance sculptor in Italy and Poland*. University Park, Penn.
- Seaford, R. (1982) 'The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*', *JHS* 102: 161–72
- Seale, D. (1972) 'The element of surprise in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *BICS* 18: 94–102
- (1982) *Vision and stagecraft in Sophocles*. Chicago
- Segal, C. (1977a) 'Synaesthesia in Sophocles', *ICS* 2: 88–96
- (1977b) 'Philoctetes and the imperishable piety', *Hermes* 105: 133–58 (reprinted in *Sophocles' tragic world: divinity, nature, society*. Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1995: 95–118)
- (1980) 'Visual symbolism and visual effects in Sophocles', *CW* 74: 125–42
- (1981) *Tragedy and civilization: an interpretation of Sophocles*, Martin Classical Lectures, 26. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Shear, J. L. (2007) 'The oath of Demophantos and the politics of Athenian identity', in A. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher, eds., *Horkos: the oath in Greek society*. Exeter: 148–60
- (2011) *Polis and revolution: responding to oligarchy in classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Sheridan, T. (1725) *The Philoctetes of Sophocles: translated from the Greek*. Dublin
- Sideris, G. [Σιδέρης, Γ.] (1970) 'Το εικοσιένα και το θέατρο ήτοι πως γεννήθηκε η νέα Ελληνική σκηνή', *Νέα Εστία*, Χριστούγεννα: 151–191.
- (1976) *Το αρχαίο θέατρο στη νέα Ελληνική σκηνή 1817–1972*, vol. 1: Athens
- Silk, M. S. (1996) 'Tragic language: the Greek tragedians and Shakespeare', in M. S. Silk, ed., *Tragedy and the tragic: Greek theatre and beyond*. Oxford: 458–96
- (2009) 'The logic of the unexpected: semantic diversion in Sophocles, Yeats (and Virgil)', in Goldhill and Hall 2009: 134–57
- Silverberg, R. (1969) *The man in the maze*. New York
- Siméon, J.-P. (2009) *Philoctète. Variation à partir de Sophocle*. Besançon
- Simon, E. (1996) 'Philoctetes—ein kranker Heros', in H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer, eds., *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, Bd. II. Tübingen: 15–39
- (2009) 'Philoctetes', in *LIMC Supplementum*. Dusseldorf: 426
- Smith, S. B. (1979) *Sherca. A play in three scenes after Sophocles' Philoctetes*. Newark, Delaware
- Spathis, D. [Σπάθης, Δ.] (1978–9) 'Ο Φιλοκτήτης του Σοφοκλή διασκευασμένος από τον Νικόλαο Πίγκολο', *Ο Ερασιστής* 15: 265–320 (reprinted in *Ο Διαφωτισμός και το Νεοελληνικό Θέατρο: Επτά μελέτες*, Thessaloniki, 1986: 145–98)
- Steidle, W. (1968) 'Die Weissagung im Philoktet und die Gestalt des Neoptolemos', in *Studien zum antiken Drama*. Munich: 169–92
- Steinbrüchel, J. J. (1760) *Philoctet, ein Trauerspiel des Sophokles*. Zurich
- Stevens, P. T. (1945) 'Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles', *CQ* 39: 95–105

- (1976) *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*. *Hermes Einzelschriften*, 38. Wiesbaden
- Strohm, H. (1986) 'Zum Trug- und Täuschungsmotiv im sophokleischen Philoktetes', *WS* 20: 109–22
- Swift, L. (2010) *The hidden chorus: echoes of genre in tragic lyric*. Oxford
- Taplin, O. (1971) 'Significant actions in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *GRBS* 12: 25–44
- (1978) *Greek tragedy in action*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- (1984–5) 'Lyric dialogue and dramatic construction in later Sophocles', *Dioniso* 55: 115–22
- (1987) 'The mapping of Sophocles' *Philoktetes*', *BICS* 34: 69–77
- Tarrant, R. J. (1986) 'Sophocles, *Philoktetes* 676–729: directions and indirections', in M. Cropp, E. Fantham and S. E. Scully, eds., *Greek tragedy and its legacy: essays presented to D. J. Conacher*. Calgary: 121–34
- Tasso, T. (1959) *Prose*, ed. E. Mazzali. Milano and Naples
- Telò, M. (2001) 'Contatto fisico vero o presunto? A proposito di Soph. *Phil.* 813–818 (con considerazioni su Soph. *El.* 1205–1210)', *SemRom* 4: 233–43
- Todd, C. (1972) *Voltaire's disciple: Jean-François de la Harpe*. London
- Topouzis, K. [Τοπούζης, Κ.] (ed.) (1992) *Σοφοκλής, Φιλοκτήτης*. Athens
- Tsitsoni, E. (1963) 'Untersuchungen der EK-Verbal-Komposita bei Sophokles', Ph.D. diss. Munich. Kallmünz
- Türk, G. (1902–9) 'Philoktetes', in W. M. Roscher, ed., *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, 3:2: 2311–43
- Turyn, A. (1952) *Studies in the manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Sophocles*. Illinois studies in language and literature, 36.1–2. Urbana
- Van Rossum-Steenbeek, M. (1998) *Greek readers' digests? Studies on a selection of subliterary papyri*, Mnemosyne Suppl., 175. Leiden, New York, Cologne
- Vasquez, P. R. (1972) 'Literary convention in scenes of madness and suffering in Greek tragedy', Ph.D. diss. Columbia University. New York
- Ventrella, G. (2008) 'Per l'attribuzione a Saturnino Salustio dell'anonima ὑπόθεσις metrica dell'Edipo a Colono', *RPh* 82: 405–18
- Versnel, H. S. (1990) *Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: three studies in henotheism. Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman religion*, 1. Leiden
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1988) 'Sophocles' *Philoktetes* and the *ephebeia*', in J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and tragedy in ancient Greece*, trans. J. Lloyd. New York: 161–79, 452–64 (originally published as 'Le Philoctète de Sophocle', in *Annales E.S.C.* 26 (1971): 623–38; reprinted in J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1972): 159–84)
- Visser, T. (1998) *Untersuchungen zum Sophokleischen Philoktet: das auslösende Ereignis in der Stückgestaltung*. Stuttgart and Leipzig
- Walcott, D. (1990) *Omeros*. New York
- Watkins, C. (1995) *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*. Oxford
- Weinstock, H. (1931) *Sophokles*. Leipzig

- Weissberg, L. (1989) 'Language's wound: Herder, Philoctetes and the origin of speech', *Modern Language Notes* 104: 548–79
- West, M. L. (1982) *Greek metre*. Oxford
- Whitby, M. (1996) 'Telemachus transformed? The origins of Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *G&R* 43: 31–42
- Whitman, C. H. (1951) *Sophocles: a study in heroic humanism*. Cambridge, Mass.
- (1958) *Homer and the heroic tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1921) *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*. 3rd edn. Berlin
- Willcock, M. M. (1970) 'Some aspects of the gods in the *Iliad*', *BICS* 17: 1–10 (reprinted in J. Wright, ed., *Essays on the Iliad. Selected Modern Criticism*. Bloomington and London, 1978: 58–69, 139–42)
- Williams, B. (1993) *Shame and necessity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London
- Wilson, E. (1941) 'The wound and the bow', in *The wound and the bow*. Boston: 272–95
- Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia: the chorus, the city, and the stage*. Cambridge
- (2009) 'Tragic honours and democracy: neglected evidence for the politics of the Athenian Dionysia', *CQ* 59: 8–29
- Winckelmann, J. J. (1982) *Winckelmann's Werke in einem Band.*, ed. H. Holtzhausen, 3rd edn. Berlin
- Wingrove, E. (2010) 'Philoctetes in the Bastille', *Cultural Critique* 74: 65–80
- Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The constraints of desire: the anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece*. New York and London
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1960) 'Discussion', in *Euripide: entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, T. 6. Vandoeuvres-Genève: 34–35
- (1969) 'Tragica', *BICS* 16: 44–54
- (1979) 'Sophoclea', *BICS* 26: 1–12
- (1980) *Sophocles: an interpretation*. Cambridge
- Wolff, C. (1979) 'A note on lions and Sophocles: *Philoctetes* 1436', in G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert and M. C. J. Putnam, eds., *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to B. M. W. Knox*. Berlin and New York: 144–50
- Woodford, S. (1966) 'Exemplum virtutis: a study of Heracles in Athens in the second half of the fifth century BC', Ph.D. diss. Columbia University. New York
- Woodhouse, W. J. (1912) 'The scenic arrangements of the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles', *JHS* 32: 239–49
- Worman, N. (1999) 'Odysseus *panourgos*: the liar's style in tragedy and oratory', *Helios* 26: 35–70
- (2000) 'Infection in the sentence: the discourse of disease in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Arethusa* 33: 1–36
- (2002) *The cast of character: style in Greek literature*. Austin
- (2008) *Abusive mouths in classical Athens*. Cambridge

- (2012) 'Cutting to the bone: recalcitrant bodies in Sophocles', in K. Ormand, ed., *A Companion to Sophocles*. Malden, Oxford, and Chichester: 351–66
- Wunder, E. (1823) *Adversaria in Sophoclis Philoctetam*. Leipzig
- Zakynthios, N. K. [Ζακύνθιος, Ν.Κ.] (1818) 'Τέχνη δραματική ἐν Ὀδησῶ', *ΕΡΜΗΣ ὁ ΛΟΓΙΟΣ* 7: 681–2
- Zuntz, G. (1955) *The political plays of Euripides*. Manchester

INDEXES

Numbers in italics refer to pages of the Introduction, non-italic to line numbers as they are recorded at the beginning of each note in the Commentary.

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abildgaard, Nicolai 52
 Accius, *Philocteta* 44
 accusative
 cognate 276–84, 279–80, 382, 522–3
 double 801–13, 915–16
 of goal or end of motion 1174–5
 of the part and the whole 821–5, 1301
 Achilles
 arms of 62–3
 association with Phil. 15–16, 26, 242–3,
 601–2, 1445–7
 death of 334–5
 father of Ne. 50–1, 260
 friend of Phil. 242–3
 Iliadic contrasted with tragic 15–16
 in the *Iliad* 24, 27, 86–95, 1102
 nature of 88–9, 1312–13
 tomb of 355–6
 Adams, George 47
 Aischylos
 Choephoroi 21
 Philoctetes 3, 4–6, 70–6
 Aithiopsis 334–5, 373, 412–13, 424–5,
 445
 Ajax 373, 410–11, 412–13, 426–7,
 1365–65b
 Alfieri, Vittorio 48
 Allègre, Antoine ('Philoctète') 49–50
 alliteration 36, 285, 294–7, 372, 383–4,
 468–70
 anachronism 11, 12, 3, 123–34, 232–3
 anacolouthon 64–5, 573–4, 1056–9
 anadiplosis 36, 205–6
 anapaests 39–40, 135–218, 1409–17,
 1445–7, 1452–71, 1469–71
 anaphora 36, 261–3, 276–84, 662–70, 827,
 1011–12, 1332–5, 1348–9
 anastrophe 6, 343, 553
 anceps syllable 37
 resolution of 38–9, 94, 307–8, 485–6,
 605–6, 742–50, 793–5
 Anthologia Palatina (AP)
 16.111 g
 16.112 g, 51
 16.113 g, 51
 antilabē 38, 39, 54, 201–2, 210, 466, 589–90,
 730–826, 750–5, 922–3, 1174–5,
 1222–60, 1248–9, 1402–8
 antithesis 97, 123–4, 285–6, 307–8, 473–4,
 993, 1418
 without parallelism 279–80
 aorist
 imperative 1074–5
 ingressive 331, 1419–20
 instantaneous 294–7, 1231
 gnomic 307–8, 637–8
 of παρέρχομαι 1358–61
 simultaneous 614–5
 tragic 1289, 1314–16
 with πρίν 1332–5
 without ἐν in indirect discourse 869–71
 aphaeresis 591
 Apollo
 and the bow of Phil. 197–8
 slayer of Achilles 334–5
 nobility of 336
 associated with paian 827–32
 Lyk(e)ios 1461–3
 apostrophe
 expressing emotion 276–82, 307
 frequency of 36
 in stichomythia 36
 multiple 242–3, 254–6, 260, 284, 793–5
 of bow 1123–45, 1128–31
 of cave 1081–1100, 1453
 of hands 1004–5
 with nouns ending in -μα 234, 867–8
 article, definite
 idiomatic with ἐν, ἐκ in Attic 1243
 in enjambment 13–14
 intensifying force of 13–14, 236–7
 omission of 100, 405–6
 neuter, with gen. in noun phrase 300,
 497
 scornful 380–1, 1060
 with superlative 236–7

Asklepios

and *paian* 827–32

sent by Her. as healer of Phil. 1437–40

sons of 1332–5, 1437–40

temple of 12, 827–32, 1437–40

assonance 36, 101, 356–8, 372, 383–4, 468–70

asymmetrical construction 1056–9

astrophic dialogue 1163–4, 1169–1217

asyndeton 11, 54–7, 300, 343, 419, 482–3, 485–6, 539, 553, 631–2, 671–3, 730–826, 774, 931–4, 1271–2, 1397

Athena

Athenian cults of 11–12, 16, 134, 1326–8

Lemnian 7

Attic dialect 31, 32, 48, 289–92, 490–2, 1243, 1275

attraction

of adjectives 759–60

of demonstrative pronouns 1

of relative pronouns 844–5

of verb tense 325–6, 528–9, 961–2; *see also* demonstrative pronoun.

Barry, James 51–2

Blake, William 52

Brumoy, Pierre 47–8

caesura 36–7, 15, 268–9, 479, 493–4, 641, 652–3, 882–8, 971–3, 1009
middle 37–8, 69, 101, 987–8, 1064–5, 1369

quasi-middle 225–6, 276–84, 359, 560, 1310–2

Chateaubrun, Jean-Baptiste Vivien de 48, 49

chiasmus 115, 356–8, 382–4, 488–96, 1128–9, 1289

Chorus 18–20, 135–218, 391–402, 676–29, 827–64

and Ne. 18–19, 135–218, 201–2, 676–29, 1143–5

anxiety and fear of 201–8

in the dramatic action 38–9

pity for Phil. 19, 169–75, 500–1, 676–729, 1146–68

role 'as one of the actors' 40

Chryse

island 1, 30, 31, 270, 1421–2

nymph 3, 9–10, 45, 194, 1326–8

Cicellis, Kay 56

Cicero, Phil. in works of 44

City Dionysia of 409, 12

clothing, Greek 223–4, 225

comparison, compendious 596–7, 683

conditional sentences

contrary-to-fact 412–13, 418, 426–7, 947–8, 1037–9, 1061–2, 1218–19

emotional future 75–6, 987–8

future less vivid 408–9, 661, 1043–4

future more vivid 999–1000, 1297–8

past general relative 289–92

mixed 116, 510–18

simple particular 1278–80

with participial clause as protasis 1161–2

with $\pi\pi\iota\nu$ 332

contrast 35, 13–14, 86, 94–5, 96–9, 101, 456–8, 481, 501–3, 545–6, 593–4, 676–80, 727–9, 927–9, 1018, 1064–5, 1269, 1365–6, 1418

dative

of agent 652–3

denoting object at which action is directed 67

ethical 493–4, 575, 832

instrumental, with $\epsilon\nu$ 60, 102

of accompanying circumstance(s) 1376–7

of means 1388

of relation 853–4

deception

by Od. 643–4

of Phil. 6, 19, 50–1, 55, 70–6, 130–1, 343, 563, 601–2, 662–70, 1007, 1111–12
through language 51–3, 239–41, 1267–9, 1409–10; *see also* lying.

deictic language and gesture 35, 37,

159–60, 265, 286, 542, 610–13,

652–3, 821–5, 839–42, 1003,

1004–5, 1074–5, 1232, 1285–7, 1426, 1450–1

 $\delta\delta\epsilon = \epsilon\gamma\omega$ 1036, 1373–5

demonstrative pronouns 200

attraction of 1, 61

correlative to relative pronoun 199

epic form of 154–5

desiderative verbs 1001, 1207–8

deus ex machina 14, 28–9, 645–7, 862–4,1402–8, 1409–17; *see also* Herakles.

Diderot, Denis 49, 50

Dio of Prusa (Chrysostomos) 4–7

Diomedes 1, 5–6, 416, 570, 596–7, 606–8

disguise 129, 542–627; *see also* deception.

Doric dialect 31–2, 668–70, 1314–16

dramatic irony 301–4, 429–30

- double construction (syntactical ambiguity) 380-1, 403-4
- dual number 29, 25, 117-19, 133, 533-4, 539-41, 541, 593-4, 627, 779-81, 1003, 1079, 1433-7
- Echidna 265-7
- echo 189-90, 1458-60
- elision
 of accented 2nd person possessive adj. 339
 multiple 361-2, 379
- elliptical expressions 424-5, 1041
- emphasis gained by position in the line or sentence 35, 37, 52, 61, 114, 121, 137-40, 251-2, 257-9, 323, 341-2, 412-13, 493-4, 519-21, 554-5, 589-90, 618-19, 628-30, 658-9, 671-3, 791-2, 880, 907, 940, 1016-17, 1204-5, 1219-21, 1254-8, 1350-2, 1365-6, 1373-5, 1404
- enjambment 33-4, 1-11, 11-12, 13-14, 260-70, 261-3, 294-7, 337-8, 485-6, 554-5, 601-2, 620-1, 626-7, 631-2, 664-6, 773, 922-3, 995-6, 1064-5, 1219-21, 1254-8, 1269, 1326-8, 1350-2, 1376-7
 in combination with hyperbaton 66-7, 77-8
 marking end of stichomythia 1407-8
- epanadiplosis 289-92
- epanaphora 1370-1
- epic correction 135-68 (metre), 1081-1122 (metre), 1123-68 (metre), 1096-7, 1098-1100, 1169-1217 (metre)
- epic tone/diction 32, 1-11, 13-14, 142, 146-7, 182, 341-2, 344, 359, 363, 377-8, 500-1, 593-4, 684, 769, 839-42, 1146-8, 1171, 1193-5, 1230, 1243, 1433-7, 1466-8, 1469
- etymological figure 36, 150, 169-75, 468-70, 605-6, 1248-9, 1380, 1419-20
- Euripides 1233
 Kyklops 17-18, 17-19
 Philoketes 4-7, 3, 35, 70-6, 111, 129, 570
- extra metrum* cries and exclamations 219, 732, 736-7, 782-82a
- False Merchant 83, 103, 539-41, 542-627, 591-7
 mythological allusions by 542-627, 548-9, 561-2, 618-19
 mythological innovations by 561-2, 593-4
- Farsetti, Tommaso Giuseppe 48
- feeding 1146-8, 1160, 1161-2
- Fénelon, François de Salignac de la Mothe 46-7
- Ferrand, Antoine-François-Claude 49
 figura etymologica; see etymological figure.
- fire 8, 294-7, 297, 927-9
 Lemnian 799-801
- friendship 26, 29-30, 530-8, 585-8, 662-70, 671-3, 674, 811-13, 1081-1217, 1163-4, 1390-1, 1402-8
- future tense
 indicative passive 68
 middle as passive 48, 302-3
 participle in purpose construction 563, 1365-6
 passive deponent 527
- generic μή 169-75, 408-9, 415, 713, 934-5, 1161-2
- genitive
 ablative 1043-4
 causal 750-5
 objective 1037-9
 of agent 3(?) 867-8, 1066-7
 of definition 81-2, 403-4, 839-42
 of separation 821-5
 of source or origin 3(?) 137-40, 194
 partitive 585-8
 predicate 239-41, 242-3
 with verbs of approaching and meeting 676-80
- Gide, André 53-4
- Goodman, Paul 56
- Guillon-Lethière, Guillaume 52
- Heaney, Seamus 55-6
- Helenos
 in *Little Iliad* L, 542-627
 prophecy 103, 603-21, 605-6, 610-13, 1339-42
 prophecy and Neoptolemos 639-40, 839-42, 1035-44
 prophecy and Odysseus 614-15, 1054-62
 prophecy not mentioned 113, 191-200, 347
- hendiadys 601-2, 869-71, 1450-1
- Hephaistos
 and arms of Achilles 402
 and Lemnos 7-8, 402, 986-7
- Herakles 9-10, 28-31, 676-729, 862-4, 1409-17

Herakles (*cont.*)

- allusions to 863-4
- arms of 197-8, 261, 656-7, 664-6, 676-729, 727-9, 776, 801-3, 943, 1061-2, 1131, 1146-8, 1163-4, 1406-7, 1409-17, 1427, 1437-40
- cults of *12*, *29*, 1409-17
- funeral pyre of *28*, *30*, 261, 664-6, 727-9, 801-3, 1061-2, 1131, 1431-3

heralds in tragedy 1305-7

Herder, Johann Gottfried 50-1

Hermes

- and mountains 1458-60
- and Odysseus 133

hiatus *40*, 100, 758-9, 917, 1003

Homer

- Iliad* *2*, 7-8, 15-16, 24, 27, 86-95, 334-5, 443-4, 548-9, 601-2, 618-19, 927-9, 967-70, 1433-7
- Od.* *2-3*, 15-16, 17, 133, 245, 377-8, 927-9, 1312-13, 1409-17

hypallage 952

- hyperbaton *35*, 276-84, 522-3, 598-600, 1013-15, 1392
- with enjambment 66-7, 77-8, 631-2

imperative

- aor. 1074-5
- perf. mid.-pass. 85
- 2nd person, following φέρε 433
- followed by ὥς clause 567, 1074-5, 1275
- of πᾶσι 1275
- following ἄλλα 230

imperfect

- conative 1365-6
- in iterative construction 289-92, 294-7, 443-4

indirect discourse

- with inf. *49*, 108, 168, 551-2 (πρίν clause) 1056-9 (neg. μή) 1329-35 (following ἴσθι)
- with ὅτι clause 346
- with participle 79 (neg. μή) 253, 407-8, 549-50, 1305-7

indirect question *27*, 70-1, 153-4, 440, 444, 544, 716-17

infinitive

- articular 118, 197-8, 234-5, 881
- epexegetic 81-2, 364-5, 524-5, 652-3, 833-5, 847-8, 889-92, 991, 1339-42, 1348-9
- for imperative 54-7
- Ionisms *32*, *31*, 482-3, 485-6, 923-4, 956, 967-70, 1098-1100, 1455

iterative construction with ἔν 289-92, 294-7; *see also* imperfect.

Ixion 676-80, 1163-4

justice 685, 1246

- and the gods 446-52, 451-2, 827-32, 1035-44, 1036, 1037-9
- manipulable 82, 85, 779-81
- natural 1153-7

Krechel, Ursula 57

Kybele *391-3*, 395, 400-1

Kypria *1*, *3*, 72-3, 1025-8, 1409-17

La Harpe, Jean-François de *48-9*

Lemnian fire 799-801

Lemnos 6, 7-8, 25-6, *31*, 1-134, *2*, 391-3, 721-6

landscape of 936-7, 1461-3

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim *9*, *50*

light

- and life 415, 624-5, 663-4, 827-32, 830-1

of glory 1332-5

'Limping Man' (*claudicans*) 8-9

lions 400-1, 1433-7

litotes 408-9, 477, 671-3

Little Iliad *1*, *3*, 64, 412-13, 561-2, 570, 1332-5

lying 329, 343-90, 391-402, 721-6, 908-9, 1365-6; *see also* deception.

Malis 4-5, 490-2, 721-6, 1040, 1213

medical terminology 696-700, 735, 750-5, 758-9, 814-18, 821-5, 872-3, 880, 1006, 1378-9, 1455

Méhul, Étienne *49*

merchants

- language of 578-9, 978
- low status of 128, 576-7

Merlis, Mark 56

messengers

- expecting rewards 551-2
- speeches of 542-627
- unaugmented verb forms in speeches of *371*, 1011-12

meta-literary allusion 377-8, 443-4

meta-theatricality 83, 542-627

metrical anomalies *4*, 22-3, 101, 730-826, 782-82a, 1402

metrical responsion *40*, *41*, 169-75, 202-3, 207-9, 218, 676-80, 685, 828, 833-5, 836, 849-51, 1092-4,

- 1096–7, 1098–1100, 1116–20,
1134–5
middle voice 510–18, 1153–7
monosyllables 34
 emphatic 1054–6
 consecutive 519–21, 626–7
Mosca, Giammaria ('Padovano') 46
Müller, Heiner 54–5
- necessity, language of 24, 50–1, 57, 116,
200, 981–3
 after τί, with force of deliberative
 subjunctive 428–30
- negation
 in commands or wishes 1367
 in dialogue 1389
 strongest form of 103, 418
 with double negative 1300–1
- Nemesis
 goddess 776
 on the part of the gods 510–18, 601–2
- Neoptolemos 5–6, 23–5, 1–134
 hesitation and indecision of 50–99, 116,
 120, 963–1080, 1066–7
 inborn nature of 47–9, 79, 86–95, 88–9,
 1066–7, 1310–12
 nobility of 50–99, 50–1, 473–81,
 799–801, 1068–9, 1402
 in traditional mythology 23, 29, 1440–4
- neuter plur. adj. used as adv. 201–2
- Nostoi* (*Returns*) 23
- Odysseus 20–3, 1–134
 and fifth-century Athens 20, 22, 3, 15,
 96–9, 123–34, 134, 608–9, 618–19
 and Herakles 1409–17
 in epic 15–16, 377–8, 618–19, 927–9,
 1409–17
 Sophistic resonance of 22–3, 6, 13–14,
 79–85, 82, 85, 111, 112, 119, 130–1,
 298–300, 431–2, 658–9, 1049–53,
 1244–6
 violence of 21, 314–15, 321, 592
- Ondaatje, Michael 56
- optative
 in apodosis of a mixed condition 116
 in indirect discourse 346, 615–16
 in purpose clause 279–80, 325–6
 in rhetorical questions 894–7
 in sequence of moods 199
 potential 20–1, 119, 894–7, 1308–9
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 44–5, 373
- Paian (deity) 166, 827–32
paian (lyric genre) 827–32, 830–1
- participle
 conjunctive 102
 expressing purpose 563, 1365–6
 supplementary 273, 671–3, 1274
- Philoktetes 25–8, 1–134
 and hero cult 30–1, 1421–2
 as savage 26, 8–9, 146–7, 708, 1263,
 1321
 as symbolically dead 16, 31, 41–2, 183,
 195–6, 207–9, 311, 624, 686, 946,
 1018
 associated with animals and wild beasts
 43–4, 164–5, 184–5, 273–5, 608–9,
 750–5, 1107–11, 1263
 disease of 25–6, 6, 257–9, 265–7, 473–4,
 973–4, 696–700, 732, 743–4, 758–9,
 1153–7, 1329–35
 heroism of 26–7, 30–1, 535–8, 668–70,
 967–70, 1230, 1348–72, 1350–2,
 1409–17, 1445–7
 isolation of 6, 31, 41–2, 169–75, 177–9,
 180–90, 212–13, 227–9, 276–84,
 286, 470–1
 myth of 1–10, 79–80
 paintings of 9
 smell of 8–11, 473–4, 889–92, 1032
 suffering of 169–75, 323, 742–50, 745,
 782–803, 814–18, 853–4, 882–8,
 1169–70, 1193–5, 1378–9, 1397,
 1458–60
 divinely imposed 177–9, 192, 1102–22,
 1116–20, 1314–47, 1316–20, 1326–8
 vase paintings of 9–10
- physical contact 763–6, 809–10, 814–8,
894–7, 1402, 1403
 hand-shake 811–3, 941–2
- piety 85, 1050–1, 1418–44, 1440–4,
1443–4
- Pikkolou, Nikolaos 53
- Pindar *Pyth.* 1.50–6, 53
- pity 500–1, 821–5, 963–1080, 965–6,
1130–9
- Plato
 Ep. 7.324b8, 96
 Rep. 338c2, 22, 130–1
- plural
 of majesty 35–7
 of modesty 64–5, 995–6, 1265–6
 used persuasively 82
- Poias 4–5, 664–6, 1210, 1370–1
- Polyphemos 17–18, 144–6, 245, 927–9
- Porson's Law 38–9, 22–3
- possessive, double (adj. and pron.) 369–70,
376
- Potter, Robert 47

- prefixes as intensifiers
 ἀπο- 225–6
 δι- 251–2
 ἐκ- 32, 13–14, 70–1, 79, 329, 1355–7
 κατα- 368
 present tense
 conative 1365–6
 oracular 113, 117, 721–6
 prodelision 16, 360, 466–7, 479, 985
 prolepsis 35, 444, 506, 544, 549–50, 573–4,
 819, 938–9, 1153–7
 purpose constructions 24–5, 464–5, 534,
 563, 1068–9, 1365–6

 realism, unconcern for 166, 422–3
 reception 43–58
 relative pronoun
 causal 684, 721–6
 epic form of 13–4
 repetition 36, 276–84, 793–5
 in stichomythia 1301
 of ἄν 289–92
 of questions 578–9
 of sounds 361–2, 727–9, 1356–7
 of words or names 451–2, 554–5, 664–6,
 688–690b, 727–9, 750–5, 759–60,
 849–51, 878–9, 907, 912–13,
 989–90, 1035, 1053, 1107–11,
 1116–20, 1169–70, 1178–80, 1219, 21,
 1241, 1244, 1280, 1370–1; *see also*
 alliteration, anadiplosis, anaphora,
 assonance, epanadiplosis,
 epanaphora, polyptoton.
 resolution, 38–9, 4, 94, 468–70, 485–6,
 500–1, 578–9, 601–2, 605–6,
 759–60, 793–5, 814–18, 914, 923–4,
 931–4, 1018, 1025–8, 1029–34,
 1226–8, 1232, 1235, 1247–8, 1302–3,
 1314–16, 1326–8, 1348–9, 1419–20;
 see also anceps syllable, resolution of.
rhēsis
 as messenger speech 371, 603–4
 ending with gnomic maxim 385–8
 rhyme, emphatic 36, 94–5, 122,
 1009
 Rich, Adrienne 57
 ring composition 1417

 salvation (σωτηρία, σώιζω, etc.) 12, 24, 28,
 109, 294–7, 297, 310–11, 488–96,
 500–6, 919–20, 1234, 1470–1
 Scammacca, O. 45
 sense-break, strong
 at multiple positions in the trimeter
 1300–1
 at position 6, 236–7, 341–2, 641, 1009,
 1016–17, 1054–6
 at position 8, 919–20
 at position 9, 791–2
 at the caesura 758–9, 922–3, 971–3
 sense-construction 356–8, 712–13, 1364
 shame 110, 120, 257–9, 608–9, 906,
 967–70, 1234, 1355–7
 Sheridan, Thomas 47
 Silverberg, Robert 56
 Sisyphos 16, 264, 383–4, 417, 449, 625,
 1310–12
 Skyros 239–41, 242–3, 325–6
 sleep 827–32, 847–8, 855–61
 Sophistic language 22–3, 80, 130–1, 431–2
 Sophistic movement 13–4, 285–99,
 298–300
 Sophoklean language and style 31–6,
 13–14, 47, 81–2, 93, 101, 109,
 814–18, 900
 -*ma* nouns 35–7, 234, 265–7, 750–5,
 867–8
 parenthetical words, clauses and
 phrases 81–2, 144–6, 400–1,
 493–4, 500–1, 1153–7, 1388,
 1437–40
 periphrasis 420, 497–9, 536–8, 600,
 867–8, 952, 1234, 1308–9, 1362,
 1406–7
 -*sis* nouns 533–4, 1236
 Sophokles
 early printed editions and translations
 45
 Aj. 31, 417
 El. 112
 OC 31, 6, 314–15
 Ph.
 and Homeric epic 33–7
 ‘false’ or ‘premature’ endings of 14,
 526, 645–6, 1217, 1402–8, 1407–8
 first production of 10
 historical context of 10–12
 uncertainty in, regarding truth 129,
 164–5, 343–90, 542–627, 603–21,
 963–1080, 1054–62
 speech, sound of 976–1003, 1411–12
 Greek 225, 225–6, 234
 Steinbrüchel, Johann Jakob 48
 stichomythia 36, 100–22, 122, 591–7, 756,
 894–7, 1222–60, 1234, 1236, 1251b,
 1301, 1390–1, 1402–8
 subjunctive 30, 645–6,
 deliberative 337–8, 1350–2
 hortatory 300, 1469
 suicide 747–8, 999–1000, 1207–8

superlatives 223-4, 236-7, 631-2, 984, 1171,
1344-6
supplication 468-506, 468-70, 485-6, 526,
530-8, 730-826, 773, 809-10,
929-30, 934-5, 967-70, 974-5,
1182-3
synaesthesia 189, 201-2
synecdoche 220-1, 355-6, 1201-2
synizesis 4, 195-6, 433-4, 446, 585-8,
736-7, 747, 758-9, 779-81, 933,
947-8, 1020, 1036, 1037-9, 1163-4,
1235, 1330-1, 1390-1

Tasso, Torquato 45-6

temporal clauses

with *ὥς ἄν* 1330-1

with *καί* 355-6,

with *πρίν* 369-70, 1329-35, 1332-5

Theatre of War (The Philoctetes Project)
57-8

Theodektes 3-4

Thersites 443-4, 445

Thucydides

3.43.2 20

3.82.8 20

tnesis 814-18, 1177

Troy, conquest of *I*, 24-5, 1061-2, 1314-17
bow needed for 68, 113, 347
by Herakles 668-70, 1437-40, 1409-17
in Helenos' prophecy 610-13, 1339-42

Violence

against bow 1128-9

of Neoptolemos, against
Philoctetes 90

of Odysseus 21, 314-15

Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet) 48

Walcott, Derek 57

Wilson, Edmund 56

Winckelmann, Johann Joachim 50

wind(s), in proverbial expressions 1160
wishes, punctuated as questions 531-2

Zeugma 273-5

Zeus

and *daimōn* 1466-8

concern with piety 1442-3

god of suppliants 468-506, 1182-3

herkeios 533-4

plans of 1409-17

supreme power of 1466-8

II GREEK WORDS

ἄ 732, 782, 1300-1

ἄν... ἄν... 222-3

ἀγνοία 129, 542-627

ἄγριος 8-9, 265-7

ἀγρίω 1321

ἀγλη [-α] 830-1

αἰνέω 889-92, 1098-1100

αἰόλος 1153-7

αἰσχρόν 108, 662-70, 971-3, 1234

αἰών 32, 1348

ἀκμή 11-12

ἀκοή 1411-12

ἀκούω 606-8, 1074-5, 1313

ἄλγησις 791-2

ἀλλά 11-14, 15, 48, 81, 232, 557-8, 763-6,
809-10, 950, 1165, 1291-2, 1402

ἄλλ' οὖν (... γέ) 1305-7

ἄλλ' οὐ τι μήν 1273

ἄλύω 169-75

ἄμειβω 1261-2

ἄν 222-3, 289-92

ἄντρον 1263

ἀπ- 1293

ἀπηγριόμαι 225-6

ἀπόλλυμι 311, 923-4, 978

ἀρετή 668-70, 1419-20

ἄστιπτος 2

ἄτιμος [ἄτιμία] 1025-8

αὐδῆ 1411-12

αὐλίον 17-19

βάθρον 999-1000

βαῖός 286

βάσις 1378-9, 1403

βία 90, 314-5, 320-1, 601-2, 643-4

βίος 931-4, 1281-3

βορά 273-5, 308-9

βρύκομαι 745

γάρ 81-2, 144-6, 248, 249, 327, 651,
756, 882-8, 1049, 1268, 1280,
1450-1

γάρ οὖν 298-300

γε 33, 105, 117, 570, 1225, 1281-3

γε μέντοι 93

γελᾶω 257-9, 1023-4, 1125

γενναῖος 50-1, 475-6, 799-801, 1068-9
γέρας 1061-2

δαίμων 1098-1100, 1187

δεινός 146-7, 456-8

δῆ 245, 276, 285, 565, 573-4, 1065, 1456-7,
1469

δῆτα 54, 130-1, 759-60

διάβορος 7

δίκαιος 1246, 1247-8

δικαιόω 779-81

δῶρον 721-6

δράω 118, 314-5, 757, 907, 908-9, 918,
974-5

δυστήνος 759-60

ἔθνος 1146-8

εἶδωλον 946-7

εἶεν 1308

εἰσοίκησις 533-4

ἐκ [ἐκ-] 32, 13-14, 55, 88-9, 271-2

ἐκαττι [ἐκτητι] 668-70

ἐκβάλλω 257-9

ἐλεέω [ἐλεεινῶς, ἔλεος] 500-1

ἐν 60, 1160

ἐν τοῖς 1243

ἐννοέω 1440-1

ἐντυγχάνω 1332-5

ἐξοῖδα 79, 407-8

ἐπαινέω 889-92

ἐπακούω 1417

ἐρέσσω 1134-5

ἐρημος 227-9, 265, 470-1

ἐσχατιά 144-6

ἐσχατον 64-5

εὐκλείης 475-6

εὐνοια 1322

εὐσέβεια 1050-1, 1443-4

ἐφημοσύνη 1143-5

ἔως ἄν 1330-1

ἦ γάρ 248, 654

ἦ... δῆ 565

ἦδη 1102-5, 1461-3

ἦ μήν 593-4

θάλλω 257-9

θανάσιμον 819

θέμις 628-75, 662

θήρα 608-9, 839-42

θνήσκω 311, 1030

θρηνέω 207-9,

θρήνος 1400-1

ἰδοῦ 776

ἰκέτεια 468-506, 468-70

ἰκέτης 929-30

ἰός 166

ἰοῦ ἰοῦ 29-39, 38-9

ἰώ 219, 1187

καί 273-5, 380-1

καί... δέ 1362

καί δῆ 818

καινός 51-3

καιρός 466-7, 833-5, 1450-1

καίτοι 1257

κακός [κακο-] 383-4, 451-2, 692-5, 908-9,

1265-6, 1305-7, 1369

καπνός 946-7

κατα- 1364

κατάγομαι 355-6

κατέχω 220-1

κάτοιδα 43-4

κατοικέω 40

κεῖμαι 144-6, 183, 359

κέρδος 111, 301-4, 578-9

κῆρ 41-2, 1167-8

κλεινός 575, 654

κλέος 1347

κλέπτω 55

κληδών 254-6

κλύω 261-3

κόπος 880

κουφίζειν 735

κρατέω 1047-8

κτῆμα 671-3

λάσκω 110

λόγος 24-5, 86-7, 407-8, 1047-8, 1267-9,

1350-2, 1409-10

μανθάνω 369-70, 541

μέν (without corresponding δέ) 1, 86,

159-60, 453, 882-8, 965-6

μήν 811-3

μή δῆτα 1367

μή οὐ 348-9, 1241

μόνος [μόνους] 61, 169-75, 183, 286,

470-1, 606-8

μῦθος 1409-10

νέμεσις 510-8, 601-2

νέος [νεοχμός] 32, 51-3, 750-5

νοσέω 674-5

νόσημα 750-5

νόσος 7, 734, 758-9

νόστος 43-4, 1470-1
 νυν 123-4, 285, 1177, 1452

ξένος 575, 733, 791-2, 923-4, 1045-6,
 1163-4

ξυνεργάτης 93
 ξυνοικέω 1167-8

οἰκησις 31
 οἶκος 159-60, 533-4
 οἰκούρημα 867-8
 οἶμαι 497-9, 1056-9
 ὄλλυμι 978
 οὐ γάρ δὴ... (γε) 246-7
 οὐ δὴ (που, ποτε) 900
 οὐ μή 103, 418
 οὐ τί που 1233
 οὔκου... γε 1389
 οὖν 121, 305
 οὐνεκα 232-3

παῖς 79, 96-9, 201-2, 589-90, 733, 742-50,
 894-7

πάλαι 806, 894-7, 965-6
 παλάμη 1206
 πανουργία 407-8
 πελάζω 1163-4
 πελάτης 1163-4
 πέμπω 912-13, 1161-2, 1428-9
 πλοῦς 466-7, 641, 1450-1
 ποικίλος [-ως] 130-1, 343
 ποικιλοστόλος 343
 πόνος 862-4, 889-92, 1419-20, 1421-2
 πότιμος 1116-20
 πρίν (ἄν) 332, 369-70, 1332-5
 προπέμπω 1204-5
 προσέχω 220-1, 236-7, 244
 προστυγχάνω 551-2
 προσφιλής [προσφιλῶς] 223-4, 361-2,
 557-8, 585-8
 προτίθημι 268-9
 προφαίνω 1191-2
 πυκ(ι)νός 853-4
 πῦρ 927-9
 πῶς (in wish) 531-2, 793-5

σκιά 946-7
 σὸν ἔργον 15
 σόφισμα 13-14
 σοφός 119, 1222-60, 1244, 1246, 1247-8
 στέγη 286, 1261-2

στέλλω 60, 623, 910-11
 στείχω 1065, 1218-19, 1402, 1407-8, 1452
 στίβος 29, 48, 157-8, 206-7
 στόλος 72-3, 343, 547
 συμφέρω 131
 συντυγχάνω 320-1
 σχῆμα 223-4, 952
 σώζω 109, 919-20

τέκνον 130-1, 236-7, 276, 671-3, 733,
742-50, 799-801, 878-9, 894-7,
 914, 1300-1, 1399

τεχνάομαι 80
 τέχνη 771
 τέχνημα 927-9
 τοι 245
 τόκος 1230
 τόξον 68, 288-9, 839-42
 τόπος 157, 204
 τροφή 32, 1125-6
 τύχη 545-6, 775, 1316-20, 1326-8
 τυγχάνω 320-1, 718-19, 1329-35

ὑπηρετέω 15, 1023-4
 ὑπηρετής 51-3
 ὑπ(ο)- 1007, 1231

φάος 415, 624-5, 663-4
 φέρε 300
 φθόνος 776
 φιλία 668
 φίλος 389-90, 671-3, 763-6, 811-13,
 1128-9, 1163-4
 φονάω 1207-8
 φορβή 43-4, 1107-11
 φύω [φύσις] 79, 164-5, 950, 1049-53,
 1052, 1066-7, 1310-12,
 1371-2

χάρις 557-8, 1370-1
 χειμέριος [χείμων, χειμάζω] 1193-5,
 1458-60
 χράομαι 1264
 χρῆμα 1231
 χρόνος 285, 360, 598-600

ῶ [ὦ] 117, 254-6, 1187,
 1348
 ῶ τᾶν 1387
 ὡς 117, 567, 812, 846, 1442-3
 ὡς ἂν 129

Sophocles' *Philoctetes* is one of the most widely read Greek tragedies today but is a complex and challenging play to interpret. Its representation of Philoctetes as a sufferer of physical and emotional pain gives it remarkable emotional power. Moreover, it juxtaposes Homeric and fifth-century institutions and values, explores honor, power, and expediency as principles of personal and political life, and represents contrasts and conflicts between innocence and experience, ends and means, and the needs and demands of the individual and those of society. This edition with commentary makes the play accessible to students, teachers, and other readers of Greek literature at all levels. It provides help with morphology, grammar, and syntax, and interpretation of the text in its historical, social, cultural, and intellectual contexts. The introduction discusses the main problems of interpretation and gives an account of its reception from antiquity to the present day.

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
www.cambridge.org

ISBN 978-0-521-68143-8



9 780521 681438